

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Vol. VI. No. 3

1955

CONTENTS

C. RABIN

JUDGES V, 2 AND THE "IDEOLOGY" OF DEBORAH'S WAR

S. M. STERN

ISAAC ISRAELI'S BOOK OF SUBSTANCES

I. TISHBY

GNOSTIC DOCTRINES IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY
JEWISH MYSTICISM

J. MAITLIS

LONDON YIDDISH LETTERS OF THE EARLY
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (1)

H. RABINOWICZ and S. LAUER

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY, R. LOEWE, B. S. J. ISSERLIN, & A. SALTMAN
CURRENT LITERATURE

5s. 6d. net
(\$0.90)
per copy

Published Quarterly

21s. net
(\$3.50)
per annum

BY

JEWISH CHRONICLE PUBLICATIONS

in association with

THE SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY & THE INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES, MANCHESTER

"Stenecourt," Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs.

Telephone: Broughton 4027

Founded in 1953, the Institute is dedicated to the pursuit of scholarly research in the fields of Biblical and Rabbinic theology, medieval Jewish philosophy and mysticism, Jewish ethical literature, Hasidic thought, and modern Jewish philosophy. Under the hon. direction of Rabbi Dr. A. Altmann, it comprises a staff of academic experts who are engaged in both research and teaching. Post-graduates of a high standard in Hebrew knowledge are admitted as research students, and receive systematic training in all branches of Jewish religious thought.

A group of "Associates" drawn from prominent Hebrew scholars of various British universities participate in the research work planned by the Institute, and contribute to its Series of Public Lectures.

The results of the researches undertaken are published in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* and other learned periodicals. Major works are scheduled to appear in a Series of Institute Publications.

Apart from the activities mentioned, the Institute seeks also to benefit Higher Jewish Education in a wider sense. It arranges study groups for university undergraduates, lecture courses for the larger public, and it has instituted Teachers' Courses.

The programme of the Institute is worked out in consultation with an Academic Advisory Board whose members include Professors D. Daube (Oxford), B. Lewis (London), G. Vajda (Paris), J. Weingreen (Dublin), J. M. Yoffey (Bristol), Dr. D. Diringer (Cambridge), and Dr. C. Rabin (Oxford).

A limited number of bursaries is available to research students. Applications are to be addressed to the Hon. Director.

The Institute is recognised as a charitable Trust by the Inland Revenue, and contributions can be covenanted. The Governing Body of the Institute comprises prominent Jewish laymen from Manchester and London.

The Prospectus of the Institute is obtainable from the Secretary.

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



ADVISORY BOARD :

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. M. Ginsberg. Prof. C. Singer.
Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

EDITORIAL BOARD :

Chairman : Rabbi A. Altmann, M.A., D.Phil.
D. Diringer, M.A., D.Litt. Professor Bernard Lewis, B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S.
E. Marmorstein, M.A. C. Rabin, M.A., D.Phil. S. Stein, Ph.D. R. J. Z.
Werblowsky, B.A., D.ès L. N. Wiedner, Ph.D.

Vol. VI. No. 3

1955

CONTENTS

	Page
C. RABIN	
JUDGES V, 2 AND THE "IDEOLOGY" OF DEBORAH'S WAR	125
S. M. STERN	
ISAAC ISRAELI'S BOOK OF SUBSTANCES	135
I. TISHBY	
GNOSTIC DOCTRINES IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY JEWISH MYSTICISM	146
J. MAITLIS	
LONDON YIDDISH LETTERS OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (1)	153
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	
H. RABINOWICZ: 1. RABBI COLON AND MESSER-LEON	166
S. LAUER: 2. EUSEBES LOGISMOS IN IV MACC.	170
R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY, R. LOEWE, B. S. J. ISSERLIN, & A. SALTMAN	
CURRENT LITERATURE	172

תורה ודתעורה

SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY

Hillel House, 1 Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1. Telephone: EUSton 8843

Trustees:

THE RT. HON. LORD COHEN, P.C.; SIR BASIL HENRIQUES; LEONARD G. MONTEFIORE; THE MARQUESS OF READING; RABBI HAROLD F. REINHART; ANTHONY DE ROTHSCHILD; MRS. MEYER SASSOON; LEONARD STEIN.

Officers:

President and Principal: RABBI DR. LEO BAECK.

Director of Studies: RABBI DR. A. LOEWENSTAMM.

Chairman: DR. E. J. COHN. *Treasurer:* DR. O. K. RABINOWICZ.

Hon. Secretary: HUGH HARRIS.

Objects:

The Society was founded in 1947 and its objects include the following: To encourage and co-ordinate academic research in Jewish subjects: (a) by establishing a library of wide application; (b) by commissioning scholars to research in Jewish subjects, and providing them with all such moral and practical assistance as may be possible; (c) by publishing or arranging for publication of approved works on Jewish subjects.

To establish a centre of higher Jewish learning for the general promotion of Jewish knowledge and study: (a) by providing the machinery and curriculum usual and necessary for the foundation and conduct of an academic institution; (b) by providing suitable courses of lectures and supervision in Jewish study and research; (c) by providing general lectures in Jewish subjects of wide appeal; (d) by providing periodicals and other publications.

Activities:

PUBLIC LECTURES are regularly held at Hillel House. They are given by distinguished figures in the world of Jewish learning, and the texts of same are from time to time reproduced in *The Journal of Jewish Studies*.

SEMINAR. The Monday morning Seminar is an important and distinctive feature of the Society's activities. For half the year Dr. Baeck lectures on Jewish History and Philosophy. During the remaining half of the year the Seminar is led by scholars representing varied fields of Jewish learning.

COURSES OF STUDY are arranged in Bible Exegesis, Talmud, Codes, Jewish Philosophy, and other subjects.

THE LIBRARY consists of about 6,500 volumes of Hebraica, Judaica, and related subjects.

Membership:

Annual Membership Subscription is £1 1s. 0d. New members will be most cordially welcomed. All communications should be addressed to: *The Secretary, Society for Jewish Study, Hillel House, 1, Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1.*

JUDGES V, 2 AND THE "IDEOLOGY" OF DEBORAH'S WAR

In re-opening the discussion on the Song of Deborah, I am conscious of treading on treacherous ground, but today, when our knowledge of Canaanite culture and literature has increased so much, we are perhaps better able to tackle again these oldest pieces of Hebrew literature—a task worthily re-started by Prof. W. F. Albright with his analysis of the Balaam songs.¹

We are fortunate in possessing in this Song of Deborah a remnant of those historical epic poems which, as the late Prof. Cassuto has shown, lie in many places behind the present prose text of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges. After Cassuto's discoveries there can be hardly any doubt that the end part of the Song is in fact nothing but the original epic narrative. Hence the first exegetical problem which faces us is this: how far does the "song" or poem itself extend?

In fixing its end it is important to establish that in this epic fragment, in contrast to the "Classical" Biblical Hebrew usage, *āz* means "when," and not "at that time."² It corresponds thus to Arabic *idh*, and like the latter governs the imperfect indicative with perfective meaning.³ The "Classical" adverb *āz* corresponds in meaning to Arabic *idhan*; it seems, therefore, that it took over the role of *ʿazay*, the etymological counterpart of *idhan*,⁴—which in our Bible occurs only in the late Ps. cxxiv—while at the same time preserving the government of the old conjunction *āz*, at least until the Late Biblical Hebrew period.⁵ In all five occurrences of the word in this chapter, the rendering "when" provides smoother translations.

If we look at the only other case in the Bible of a song of victory embedded in the narrative, namely, the Song at the Sea, we find that at its end the narrative re-opens with a brief summary of the occasion on which it was sung: "When⁶ the horse of Pharaoh came with its chariot and his cavalry into the sea, etc." (Ex. xv, 19).

¹ JBL 63 (1944) 207–33. Cf. also his programmatic "The Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature," *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 7 (1945) 5–31. ALBRIGHT wrote on Ju. v in *JPOS* 2 (1922) 73–83.

² It is so translated by GRIMME in *ZDMG* 50 (1896) 572–8.

³ RECKENDORF, *Arabische Syntax*, 1921, p. 469: oft ist auch das Imperf. präterital.

⁴ Often spelt *'dhy*, i.e., *idhayn* (?), cf. Aram. *ʿdayin*. The identity is stated BEN-YEHUDA, *Thesaurus* I, 125. Grammarians (as far as they mention *ʿzay* at all) and lexicographers generally call *ʿzay* "archaizing."

⁵ Cf. BROCKELMANN, *GVG* II, 147.

⁶ RASHI points out that *k* is here temporal.

Such a summary is found in Ju. v, 19: "When the kings of the Canaanites fought at Taanakh at the waters of Megiddo." The "song" therefore ends with the words "Kings came and fought."⁷

It has been seen by many commentators⁸ that the real beginning of the "song" must be "Hear o kings . . .," i.e., verse 3, and it has been variously suggested to place verse 2 somewhere else within the poem. The recognition that the poetical part of chapter v contains also narrative matter enables us to account differently for verse 2: it is the last bit of the narrative preceding the "song". Most probably parts of verse 1 also belong to the epic, but the rhythm has been destroyed by additions. Verse 2 therefore describes the occasion on which the "song" was recited; and we should expect it to give us, in brief form, some indication of the contents of the "song" itself.

The "song" distinctly falls into three parts: (a) the exordium (3-5), (b) the description of the time "until thou didst arise, o Deborah" (6-8),⁹ and (c) the section 9-19a, enumerating the tribes who fought and those who did not. This section begins with *לבי לחוקק ישראל*. I would suggest that the first word is the Hebrew counterpart to Arabic *labbai-ka* "hail to thee,"¹⁰ said when confronted with a person of higher social status,¹¹ as also by the Muslim pilgrim when appearing before Allah by entering the holy territory. We have before us a kind of teichoscopy, enumerating the tribes according to the directions from which they approach: south¹² (Ephraim, Benjamin), east (Makhir=Menasseh, Zebulun, Issachar), north (Asher, Naphtali).¹³ We can now also see why Benjamin, dwelling further south, comes with its troops "behind" Ephraim (verse 14). This section has its own exordium, and it seems that the various descriptions in vss. 9-10 apply to the "leaders" approaching with their troops.¹⁴

⁷ Read perhaps, adding only one down-stroke, *nillāhēmāh*: "come, o kings, and let us fight."

⁸ Cf. MOORE in *SBOT Judges*, 1898, p. 64.

⁹ It does not affect our analysis much whether Deborah was a person or a city, as proposed by NIEBUHR, *Versuch einer Rekonstellation des D.-liedes*, 1894, p. 11, and ALBRIGHT, *JPOS* 1 (1920-1) 61; *ibid.* 2 (1922) 81.

¹⁰ No acceptable etymology for this has been proposed; some think it is borrowed from Aram. *le-appak* "before thee (I stand)."

¹¹ E.g., by Abū Hurairah waking from a faint and seeing Mohammed bending over him, TORREY's *Selections from . . . Bukhārī*, p. 5, 2.

¹² Along the Aron-Megiddo mountain-road.

¹³ A geographical arrangement is also envisaged by EISSFELDT, *Quellen des Richterbuches*, 1925, p. 29, n. 2, 3: each major tribe is followed by a neighbouring minor one.

¹⁴ These "staff-bearers" symbolize both the splendour and the collective will of their groups.

In contrast to the splendid appearance of the tribal levies marching towards the meeting-place, the "days of Shamgar ben Anath" are painted in the darkest colours. "They abandoned¹⁵ the highways,"¹⁶ out of cowardice. "May God love¹⁷ the young men¹⁸: when there was fighting¹⁹ at the gates,²⁰ not one shield or lance was seen among forty thousand of Israel."²¹

One quality was conspicuously absent during that time: "they abandoned *p^erāzōn*²² in Israel, they abandoned it" (vs. 7). In vs. 11, which celebrates the restitution of this quality, it is sufficiently important to be linked with the name of God. The renderings of this word are legion; Moore remarks that "no rendering which suits one of these places seems possible in the other." It seems to me that the one rendering which fits both is "championship," in which both in form and meaning it corresponds exactly to the Ar. verbal noun *barazān*.²³ This is supported by LXX B *dynatoi* in 7 and LXX A *enischysan*, etc. in 11, also by *dynastōn* in Hab. iii, 14.²⁴ Hebrew *prz* corresponds to Ar. *brz* also in its other meaning of "open, unwall'd": *p^erāzī* is exactly=*barāz* "large open unobstructed space."²⁵ The alternation of *b* and *p* is due to the presence of the *r*, and can be observed also in Heb. *ʿrāḇōt*—Ugar. *ʿrpt* "clouds, heaven,"²⁶ Heb. *ʿibrīm*—Ugar. *ʿprm*, etc., Arab. *ašrafa* "be high, look down"—Ar. *mašrubah* "upper room," *išraʿabba* "stretch one's neck"—Mishnaic Heb. *hištarbēb*, id.^{26a}

¹⁵ So LXX B group; cf. South-Arab. *khdl* "abstinit a, neglexit" (Conti-Rossini), Ar. *khadhila* "to neglect" (note the irregular *dh-d*).

¹⁶ "Caravans" in settled country would have been a sign of insecurity.

¹⁷ So LXX A group (*hēretisan*, Syrohexapla "they love.")

¹⁸ Cf. Ar. *ahdāth*, "young men, apprentices," but also "recruits" (v. KREMER, *Culturgeschichte*, etc., I [1875] p. 200, confirmed by FAGNAN *Additions aux dictionnaires arabes*, 1923, p. 30) or, more correctly, "civil militia" (v. GRUNEBaum, *Islam*, 1955, p. 151).

¹⁹ Read *lohām*=*luham*, impersonal passive Qal; so already EWALD, *Geschichte Israels*, 3rd ed., II, 501, note.

²⁰ Or "frontiers," cf. Ar. *thaghr* "mountain pass, frontier."

²¹ Negative oath, introduced ironically by "may God love." In Ar. "may God kill thee" often introduces compliments, and *lillāhi darruka* "thy soul is commended to God" sometimes vituperation.

²² Better *pērazōn* (*gittālōn*), since with suffixes it is *pirzon-o* (vs. 11).

²³ Connection with Ar. *baraza* was suggested by F. HITZIG, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 4th ed., 1881, p. 292 (not in the 1st edn., 1838).

²⁴ I suspect that *basileis* for *ʿrāḇōt* in vs. 6a in LXX A and derived versions represents *p^erāzōn* and got into the wrong verse because of the *exelipon* preceding both *hodos* in vs. 6 and **basileis*=*p^erazon* in 7.

²⁵ *Lisān al-ʿArab* VII, 172. KOEHLER, *Lexicon*, gives Ar. *farz*, which he says means "eine Niederlassung zwischen zwei Bergen." In reality *farz* means "a valley dividing (*faraza*) two mountains" (*Lisān* VII, 285).

²⁶ Cf. ALBRIGHT, *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 7 (1945) 25-6.

^{26a} Also Ugar *bcl* "to do, work" for Heb., Aram., Arab. *pcl*, cf. VIROLLEAUD, *Comptes Rendus du GLECS* 7 (1955) 2; *ib.* 21.

In both passages "championship" is followed by "in Israel." It seems, therefore, that in vs. 11 it is not God who is the champion, but *pirzōnō* is rather "the championship devoted to Him in Israel," i.e., "championship" is a way in which Israel particularly associates itself with God, "the man of war" (Ex. xv, 3)²⁷ and through which it becomes "the people of God" (vs. 11).²⁸ In this way it is possible for the poet to equate in his parallelism "the rightful deeds²⁹ of His championship in Israel" with the "rightful deeds of God" Himself.

According to this reading of the "song"—as indeed on any other reading known to me—there is not a word in it about the oppression by the king of Hazor described in iv, 2–3. The attitude throughout is that it is the people's duty to fight, and not to be diverted from this duty by its herds (verse 16) or trade (? , verse 17). It is not just the duty to come to the assistance of the tribes directly affected by the contact with the kingdom of Hazor, for Issachar, Naphtali, and Zebulun, the tribes nearest the enemy, come in for just as much praise as the distant Ephraimites and Benjaminites, and the distant Reuben is blamed more for its non-participation than the tribe of Asher close by. The word "help" is used only in the narrative part of the epic, and then in connection with the non-Israelite city of Meroz (verse 23).

In view of this attitude, the word *hitnaddeḅ*, if translated "to volunteer," does not ring quite true, especially if we consider that in verse 9 it is the "leaders" who "volunteer with the people" or even, according to A.V., "among the people." But does the verb really mean this? The translation seems to be based on the cognate *nēdāḅāh* "freewill offering" and on the rendering *hekousiasthēnai* found in all MSS of the LXX B group³⁰ except B itself,³¹ and *hekousiasmos* in Aquilas.³² In the A group we find *proairesis* "will, decision," which no doubt also lies behind the renderings of the Syrohexapla, the Ethiopic, and Origen's

²⁷ On the reading "champion (*gibbōr*) of war" see *JTS* 6 (1955) 177.

²⁸ This phrase occurs Nu. xi, 29; xvii, 6; 1 Sam. ii, 24; in 2 Sam. vi, 21 and 2 Kings ix, 6 it was already felt necessary to explain it by the addition *aet Yisrā'el*. In the Prophets only Zeph. ii, 10. Cf. also below on "the people blessed by God."

²⁹ In the older meaning of *šdq*, still common in South-Arabian, cf. ROSENTHAL, *HUCA* 23, 1 (1950–1) 415–6.

³⁰ I follow the classification of PRETZL (*Biblica* 7 [1926] 238), which has been accepted by BILLEN (*JTS* 43 [1943] 12–19) and SOISALON-SOININEN, *Textformen der Septuaginta-Uebersetzung des Richterbuches*, Helsinki, 1951.

³¹ With *akousiasthēnai*.

³² Frequent in Aq.; in LXX only 2 Esdr. vii, 16.

voluntatibus.³³ This is the only time that *p.* is used in LXX for the root *ndb*,³⁴ and it is a strange rendering, since *p.* generally has an unfavourable meaning, translating *r^{ec}ūt*, *ra^cyōn*, *tarmīt*. One MS of the AII group, n=Oxford, Bodl. Univ. Coll. 52,³⁵ has *proeleusis*, a word used only by Symmachus for various verbal nouns of *ὑφ'*, and meaning "issuing forth." Since this is the rarer word, it seems not unlikely that this one MS has here preserved the genuine reading.³⁶

It is true that in Chr., Ezr., Neh., the only books where our verb occurs apart from the Song, it does mean actions carried out of one's own free will, except perhaps in Neh. xi, 2, where the *miṭnadd^ehīm* are chosen by lot. On the other hand we are not entitled to argue from post-exilic usage about that of some 700 years earlier. It is, after all, quite probable that the late use is denominative from *n^edābāh*.³⁷

Schwally³⁸ suggested that the *nādīb* was originally the man obliged to fight in war. This may have been the primary, technical meaning of Arabic *nadb*, **nadīb*,³⁹ "one who responds with alacrity in an emergency."⁴⁰ Pedersen⁴¹ saw that the verb here is connected with *nādīb*: he translates it "for the noble deeds," basing himself on a sense which *nādīb* may only have got at a later date, when the military meaning had become obscured by changes in social structure.

The sense of obligation is clearly implied in Arabic *nadaba* "to call someone to do his duty in war and otherwise," *intadaba* "to follow a call to duty." The *Lisān* adds: "people may also *intadaba* of their own free will, without anyone inviting them to do so"; this not only shows a change of meaning similar to that in Hebrew, but also that the "call" need not issue from a person, but from social convention. The use of Heb. *ndb* Qal is very similar to *nadaba*. Now *nadaba* also means "to address the dead with

³³ *In Libr. Jud. Hom. vi* (MIGNE, *Patr. Gr.* XII, 974).

³⁴ Since in vs. 9 the A group, too, has *hekousiazomenoi*.

³⁵ Dated 1126 C.E.

³⁶ Also in a passage of Lucian *proairesis* and *proeleusis* are confused, cf. Liddell-Scott sub *proeleusis*.

³⁷ Which is possibly borrowed from Accadian *nidbu*, *nindabu* "voluntary food-offering," a word etymologically isolated in Acc. and hence perhaps of non-Semitic origin.

³⁸ *Semitische Kriegsaltertümer I: Der heilige Krieg in Israel*, 1901, p. 47.

³⁹ This latter form is not recorded in the lexicæ, but its existence is guaranteed by the plural *nudabā'u*.

⁴⁰ *Lisān* II, 251, whence also the following material.

⁴¹ *Israel, Its Life and Culture* III-IV, 2, anticipated by ZAPLETAL, *Buch der Richter* 1923, p. 71.

honorific epithets"; from this meaning we may derive Eth. *mandabē* "affliction."⁴² These two meanings of the root suggest that it is nothing but *nadā bi-* "to call upon," with the *b* incorporated into the root.⁴³ An interesting secondary use of the root is in connection with gambling. Ar. *nadab* is "stake in a wager"; its synonym is *wajb*, from *wjb* "to be obligatory," for a stake is the thing a gambler is "called upon" to lay down or to produce if he loses. From this we get *andaba bi-naṣsihi* "he staked his life, endangered himself," cf. Heb. השליך נפשו מנגד, literally "cast his life before the opponent." It is particularly interesting that a phrase corresponding to this is employed of Zebulun (vs. 18), חָרַף נַפְשׁוֹ לָמוּת, which hardly means "despised his life unto death," but rather "set aside⁴⁴ his life to death,"⁴⁵ like an object in a wager put down between the players.⁴⁶

If we thus give to *hiṭnaddēb* the meaning "to go to war in answer to a call," we can account not only for *proeleusis*, but also for its use with *b^e-* in vs. 9, for as a verb of motion it is made transitive by *b^e-*, as commonly in Arabic, and means "the leaders who lead the people into battle in response to a call." Hence also in both passages the verb is used with 'am, which we may confidently assume to be used here in the sense of the "Heerbann," the tribes acting together as a military organization. Such a body, of course, does not "volunteer"—a concept we should rather associate with individuals—but organizes according to fixed conventions.

In both cases where it appears with *hiṭnaddēb*, 'am is followed by בָּרְכוּ ה'. Many commentators have excised this phrase as "a late insertion,"⁴⁷ but we ought to ask ourselves what could possibly have moved a redactor to insert the words "bless ye the Lord" just after the phrase in question. We may, therefore, accept the suggestion in the apparatus of BH³ to read *b^erūkēy*, בָּרְכוּ (כי); in view of the identity of *y* and *w* in the script of the Dead Sea Scrolls, this can hardly be called an emendation. We have here a phrase of the same type as "the people of God" in vs. 11.

We would, according to the laws of parallelism, expect the first hemistich, בִּפְרַע פְּרַעוֹת בִּישְׂרָאֵל, to have a meaning somewhat

⁴² And Ar. *nadabah* "a scar," if it was originally one inflicted for mourning (as in Dt. xiv, 1).

⁴³ Cf. Colloquial Ar. *jāb* "he brought," from *jā'a bi-*; in Heb. *sārāb* "stubborn," from *sār b^e-*, as kindly pointed out by Prof. Driver.

⁴⁴ I.e., *hrp* IV of BDB (Niph'al Lev. xix, 26).

⁴⁵ Read *la-māwaet*, with LXX.

⁴⁶ Perhaps also Ar. *nadab* "bowshot" belongs to this sphere, since this was a common form of gambling.

⁴⁷ E.g., ZAPLETAL (note 41).

similar to that of *hitnaddēb*. This parallelism is absent in the two standard translations "when hair was worn long in Israel" and "when leaders led in Israel." We can easily dispose of the first rendering, the objections to which have been marshalled by Segond.⁴⁸ It has no backing in the versions,⁴⁹ and *pr*^c means, at best, to have dishevelled hair, not long hair. There is preciously little evidence of a custom of growing hair long among Semites, though it no doubt existed among the ancient Teutons⁵⁰ and in Oceania.⁵¹ The German edition of Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites* (p. 253) is quoted in support, but the edition accessible to me, the revised English one of 1894, has no hint of it, nor does Wellhausen, though he accepts the idea, adduce one Arabic instance.⁵² The only Arabic reference known to me shows that before a decisive battle the warriors shave their heads.⁵³ Haupt adduces some irrelevant remarks about the difficulty of having haircuts on campaigns.⁵⁴ Pedersen, surely the scholar most qualified to judge ethnological matters, has dropped this theory.⁵⁵ The rendering does not fit Dt. xxxii, 42, מראש פרעות ארִיב, if only because "the long-haired heads of the foe" would in Hebrew be **par^cōt rōš ʾōyēb*.⁵⁶

The second rendering, "leaders" goes back to LXX A, L and Theod. *en tō arxasthai archēgous*; a similar rendering is found in Dt. xxxii, 42: *apo kephalēs archontōn*. Actually, Arabic *far^c* is not the best word to adduce as etymological justification, for the *Lisān*⁵⁷ shows it to mean "eminent man" only in one standard idiom where it is metaphorical. The sense of eminence exists in *tafarra^ca min* "to be nobler than" and *tafarra^ca* "to marry a woman of the chief family of a tribe." Some derivations mean "summit," or the like, and others "to go up" or "to go down." The original sense of the root seems to have been "top of the head," as in *fara^ca ra'sahu* "he hit him on the head" (cf. Engl. slang "to crown someone.") To *tafarra^ca* "to marry the chief's daughter," the

⁴⁸ *Le Cantique de Debora*, 1900, p. 19.

⁴⁹ On LXX B, see below.

⁵⁰ TACITUS, *Germania* xxxi (this passage was kindly communicated to me by Prof. Driver).

⁵¹ Cf. SCHWALLY (note 38), pp. 69–74 "Das Haar-Tabu."

⁵² *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, 2nd ed., p. 123.

⁵³ *Hamāsah*, ed. FREYTAG, p. 253.

⁵⁴ *Die Schlacht von Taanach* (Beihefte z. ZATW xxvii), 1914, p. 197.

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.* (note 41), p. 671.

⁵⁶ H. L. GINSBERG, *Tarbiš* 24 (1954–5) 3, reads š^eēr "flesh" for rōš. He remarks that *par^cōt* may mean "long hair," but that this cannot be proved from Dt. xxxii, 42.

⁵⁷ X, 117, from where also the following material.

synonyms are *tanaṣṣā*, from *nāṣiyah* "forelock" and *tadhorrā*, from *dhirwah* "top of the head," also "summit." From "head" seem to be derived *far^c*, Heb. *pāra^c* "head full of hair" (as opposed to bald), Syr. *per^cā* "bud," Ar. *far^c* "branch," Mishnaic *p^{rā}ōt* "protruding branches." There is thus very little support for the meaning "leader."⁵⁸

The LXX phrase cannot be translated "when leaders led," for that would be **arxai*, not *arxasthai*, which means "began." It is understood as "began" by the secondary versions,⁵⁹ and the old sources quoted by Lagarde⁶⁰ and Moore.⁶¹ The translators thus seem to have known of a Hebrew cognate to Ar. *afra^ca* "to begin, get first to the pasture ground, see the first trace of menstrual blood," *iftara^ca*, *istafra^ca* "to start telling a story."

Pesh. and one of the several translations in Tg. connect our phrase with "revenge," cf. Aram. *pur^cānūtā*, etc. This is syntactically difficult, as then it would mean "when revenge was taken upon Israel," a meaning actually adopted in one of the Tg. renderings and by Rashi.

However, the meaning "revenge" is secondary, the primary one being "to pay a debt," cf. Mishnaic *pāra^c* "pay a debt," *nīpra^c* "to collect a debt," *š^ctār pārūa^c* "a paid bill," *pērā^cōn* "payment." The root occurs in this meaning in Aramaic, possibly as early as the Elephantine Papyri.⁶² In Syriac it has produced *p^{rā}c* "to pay, repay," *pur^cānā*, *pur^cānūtā* "payment," *etp^{rā}c* "to be paid, to receive"; in Christian Palestinian Aramaic *pur^{ce}tā* "remuneration," *etp^{rā}c* "to accept payment."

It is generally assumed that this is cognate with Ar. *farḍ⁶³* "share," *iftaraḍa* "to receive pay"; the original meaning of the Ar. root is perhaps that of *farāḍa* "to notch," cf. English "tally." In that case, of course, the Mishnaic Hebrew words would be borrowed from Aramaic. Actually this would not prevent us from

⁵⁸ Ugaritic *pr^c* in the text GORDON 60 was interpreted by VIROLLAUD (*Syria* 15 [1934] 54) as "prince," but that text is most probably Hurrian. GORDON (*Ugaritic Literature*, 1949, p. 37) tentatively translates *pr^ct* in IIAB vii, 56 as "distinguished." The meaning of the root in 2 Aqht v, 37, 38, and text 124, line 24, is not clear.

⁵⁹ Syroh. *m^cšarrin*, Eth. *akhazū*.

⁶⁰ *Septuaginta-Studien* I, 1891, p. 59.

⁶¹ *Judges* (I.C.C.), 1895, p. 138 (Procopius).

⁶² COWLEY, *Aramaic Papyri*, no. 17 line 6, but the reading is uncertain and the context broken.

⁶³ In Islamic usage, *fard* means "religious duty" (cf. *Enc. of Isl.* 11, 61)—the word thus passed through the same semantic development as that which is here claimed for the Hebrew root *pr^c*.

finding this meaning in our chapter, which also contains the Aramaisms *y^etannū*, *māh^eqāh*,⁶⁴ *ca*māmāēkā, *t^eyabbēh*.⁶⁵

Arabic, however, has a number of derivations which suggest that the root *pr^c* could bear the meaning "to give someone his due," e.g. *fāra'a* "give a man sufficient so that he need not worry, do one's duty towards a guest," *afra'a 'l-wādī ahlahu* "the valley provided sufficiency for its inhabitants," *fara'(ah)* "first-born of an animal (sacrificed in pre-Islamic times), the camel sacrificed out of one hundred." In Minaean, *fr^c* denotes something which is regularly sacrificed to the gods (first-fruit?), while Sabaeen *fr^c* "produce," like Syr. *p^rrā^cā*, may either be connected with *far^c* "branch, bud" or be the "due" which the earth produces.⁶⁶

The Targum connects vs. 2a with this meaning of the root, in its further development to "vengeance" (*pur^cānūt*, Syr. *pur^cān[ūt]ā*), "divine judgment." This, and not the "uncovering of the head,"⁶⁷ is also the meaning of *apokalyphthē apokalymma* in LXX B and Symm. The noun *apokalymma* occurs, as far as I have been able to discover, nowhere else in Greek; the verb translates *pr^c* in Nu. v. 18, and apparently *higgīd* in Josh. ii, 20. It seems as if the verb were imported from the Nu. passage⁶⁸ and *apokalymma* expressly created to translate the Hebrew term for God's terrible revelation on the day of judgment,⁶⁹ the *apokalypsis* of the N.T.

Taking this *pr^c* II in its simplest meaning, and construing *p^rrōā^c* *p^rrā^cōt* as an impersonal infinitive with cognate object, we obtain a rendering with almost perfect parallelism, which adds no new element absent in the "song," but on the contrary sums up and underlines its moral:

"when duty was done in Israel, when the God-blessed people answered the call."

The war against the Canaanites was thus, as the Rabbis put it many centuries later, a מלחמת חובה. Participation is incumbent on all tribes, irrespective of their distance from the battlefield,

⁶⁴ This must be different from Common Semitic *mhq* "to rub out," and is probably cognate with *mhš*. The use of the Hebrew and the Aramaic form in the same verse may be an intentional *jeu d'esprit*.

⁶⁵ The latter two in NIEBUHR (note 9), p. 6.

⁶⁶ I take this opportunity of thanking Prof. A. F. L. Beeston for informing me about these South-Arabian words.

⁶⁷ I cannot see how BURNEY, *Book of Judges*, 1918, p. 108, can understand *anakalypsasthai* as meaning "to wear the hair loose."

⁶⁸ From where Symm. even took over *tēn kephalēn*.

⁶⁹ A similar explanation of *apokalymma* was proposed, on different grounds, by A. J. BRACHMANN, *JQR* 39 (1948-9) 413.

and in spite of the fact that victory would benefit only the tribes in its immediate neighbourhood. The behaviour expected is that of the Transjordanian tribes who in Joshua's time left their allotted homes to assist in the conquest of Western Palestine.

Nothing could demonstrate more clearly than the "song" how much this spirit of military co-operation had weakened since some tribes had acquired prosperity and political interests of their own. If the epos of which the Song forms part was meant to keep this spirit alive, it certainly failed. Later, under the threat of Philistine domination, unity of an entirely different kind was achieved and led gradually to the breakdown of the tribal structure.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

ISAAC ISRAELI'S BOOK OF SUBSTANCES

The first mention of Israeli's *Book of Substances*¹ occurs as early as 1876, in A. Neubauer's account of the Second Firkowicz Collection of Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic MSS., mostly coming from the Geniza, in which he mentions "Isaac Israeli's unknown treatise, called *Kitāb al-Jawāhir*."² This short allusion, however, passed unnoticed. The text to which Neubauer referred is no doubt that contained in a fragment of three folios numbered 2nd Firk. coll., hebr. arab. nova, No. 1243, later described in the handwritten inventory of the collection made by P. Kokowzoff as: "No. 1243—a fragment of the treatise *Kitāb al-Jawāhir* by Isaac Israeli—3 folios." The identification of the fragment was a simple matter, as it included the title-page which gives the full title and the author's name.

In 1929, A. Borisov succeeded in finding, among the fragments of the same collection, a further fifteen folios from the same manuscript, so that altogether eighteen folios of it were recovered. According to Borisov's statement in his account of the discovery, the press-mark of this second fragment is 2nd Firk. coll., hebr. arab. nova, No. 1197. This number, however, is incorrect as we shall presently see, and the article itself, containing Borisov's account, constitutes something of a literary problem. Offprints of the article came into the possession of various scholars, but the identity of the periodical to which it belongs cannot be established. In a bibliographical survey, incorporated in *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*, 1936: *Abstracta Islamica*, p. 318, it is stated that the article appeared in *Bibliografia Vostoka*, viii-ix, 1936, 621-8; but an examination of that periodical showed that it contained no such article, neither on the pages given in the reference nor elsewhere. It is not improbable that the offprints were made from sheets destined for some publication which then never actually appeared.³ (I possess a typewritten copy made from an offprint which was in the possession of Dr. S. Pines.⁴)

¹ The essential bibliography for Israeli (end of ninth, beginning of tenth centuries) is as follows: M. STEINSCHNEIDER, *Die Hebr. Übersetzungen des Mittelalters*, 389ff.; *idem*, *Die arabische Litteratur der Juden*, 38ff.; S. POZNANSKY, *Anshe Kayruan*, in *Harkavy-Festschrift*, 207ff.; J. GUTTMAN, *Die philosophischen Lehren des Isaac B. Salomo Israeli*; G. VAJDA, *Le Commentaire kairouanais du "Livre de la Creation"*, *Revue des Etudes Juives*, 1946-47, and following years.

² *Oxford University Gazette*, vii, No. 237, p. 6.

³ This is the opinion expressed by Dr. G. VAJDA in a letter to Dr. A. ALTMANN.

⁴ Some of the preceding information is also derived from BORISOV's article.

In 1949 I found two folios of the treatise among the Geniza fragments of the British Museum, Or. 5564 B, fols. 8-9. The text contained in these folios runs parallel with part of the text of the Leningrad fragment discovered by Borisov.

At the request of the Institute of Jewish Studies, the John Rylands Library and the Manchester Central Library obtained in 1954 photographs of MSS. Nos. 1243 and 1197 from the Leningrad Public Library.⁵ No. 1243 turned out to contain what had been expected—three folios of the *Book of Substances*; No. 1197, however, was found to have nothing to do with Israeli at all. It is a MS. of the *Theology of Aristotle*—in effect one of the MSS. of that work discovered by Borisov himself, and described in his article on the *Theology*⁶; in that article he mentions it under its correct press-mark (2nd Firk. coll., 1197), and gives it the siglum B. It is obvious, therefore, that this number slipped by an error into Borisov's description of his discovery of the Israeli MS. In the early thirties Borisov was working simultaneously on his discoveries concerning Israeli and the *Theology of Aristotle*, and by an oversight he reproduced in his description of the former the number connected with the latter. This has the regrettable consequence that at present the correct press-mark for the fifteen folios discovered by Borisov is unknown and no photographs of them can be obtained until it is found.

I publish here the original text and a translation of the fragments of the work which are at present available, viz., the three folios of the Leningrad Library mentioned by Neubauer and the two of the British Museum found by myself. As the fifteen folios found by Borisov are not available, I shall reproduce Borisov's analysis of their contents. I do not comment here upon the text, which is of a great importance for a deeper understanding of Israeli's philosophy as well as for Islamic and Jewish Neoplatonism in general; it will be fully dealt with in the larger context of a volume on Israeli prepared jointly by Dr. A. Altmann and myself.⁷

⁵ Cf. the article by Dr. ALTMANN in *Manchester Review*, published quarterly by the Libraries' Committee, Autumn, 1955 (vol. vii, pp. 245-7).

⁶ A. BORISOV, *The Arabic original of the Latin version of the treatise called "Theology of Aristotle"* (in Russian), *Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov*, v, 1930, 83-98; cf. *idem*, *On the point of departure of the voluntarist philosophy of Solomon Ibn Gabirol* (in Russian), *Bull. d l'Acad. des Sciences de l'U.R.S.S., Class. of Soc. Sciences*, 1933, 755-68.

⁷ It is my pleasant duty to thank the Institute of Jewish Studies, Manchester, for placing the photographs of the Leningrad MS. at my disposal; Dr. S. PINES, who made available to me a copy of BORISOV's article, which aroused my interest in the Leningrad fragments and made possible the identification of the British Museum fragment; and Professor G. SCHOLEM, who, many years ago, had brought Dr. PINES' copy to my knowledge.

BORISOV'S ANALYSIS OF THE CONTENTS OF THE BOOK OF SUBSTANCES⁸

The full title of this book is: "The Book of Substances, upon the compilation of which from the sayings and the texts of the ancients worked the perfect master Abū Ya'kūb Ishāk ben Suleimān al-Isrā'īlī, the physician—grace and favour of God be with him!" [Note: the Arabic original of the title]. This treatise presents an answer to the question of a certain dialectician—"on the substance that is generic in reality and the substance called generic relatively and metaphorically" [Note: containing the Arabic original]. The treatise is written in the form of a dispute, so much favoured by the Mutakallimūn and the early Arabic philosophers; it tells us with prolixity and numerous repetitions that the first creations were two simple substances, Matter (*hayūlā*) and Form (*ṣūra*), while Intellect, being the first link in the chain of emanation, consists of these two simplest elements. Further, the author considers "the diversity of substances and the preference of one substance to another, according to their spirituality and degree" [Note: Fol. 10r, *ikhtilāfu'l-jawāhiri wa taqḍimu (taqaddumu?) ba'dihā 'alā ba'din fi'l-ruḥāniyya wa'l-martaba*], as depending on three causes: the first is, how the Light (*al-nūr*), proceeding from the Might and Will (*min al-qudra wa'l-irāda*), spreads; the second is, how the different substances receive the Light one from another; and the last is the difference of the giver and the receiver, the act of giving and act of receiving [Note: Fol. 10v, *al-ikhtilāfu'l-wāqi'u bayna'l-mufīdi wa'l-mufādi wa'l-ifādati wa'l-istiḥādati*]. The succession of substances is as follows: (a) the Intellect (*al-'aql*), the most noble and sublime of substances, being directly under the influence of Might and Will; (b) the Rational Soul (*al-naḥs al-nāṭiqā*) that receives its Light from the Intellect and requires instruction (*al-ta'lim*) and practice (*al-riyāḍa*) for being able to transfer the potential into the state of actuality; (c) the Animal Soul (*al-naḥs al-ḥayawāniyya*) that receives the Light from the Rational Soul and possesses the corporeal senses; (d) the Vegetative Soul (*al-naḥs al-nabātiyya*), having only the instinct of reproduction (*al-shahwa li'l-tawallud*), receives the Light from the Animal Soul; (e) the Nature (*al-ṭabī'a*), the substance remotest from the True

⁸ The analysis is reproduced verbatim from BORISOV'S article and it was not thought convenient to change occasional odd expressions.

Light (*al-nūr al-ḥaqq*) and hence being carnal; and though the term "Nature" has several meanings, actually we have to understand it as the energy of the celestial spheres (*al-quwwa al-falakiyya*). Then, after Nature, follow (f) the Elements (*al-'anāṣir*)—Earth, Water, Air, and Fire—together with their qualities (*kayfiyyāt*)—dryness, heat, cold, and moisture; they are pure shadows (*al-zill al-mahḍ*), receiving the Light from the Corporeal Nature (*al-tabī'a al-jismāniyya*); they are subjected to mixing (*mizāj*), genesis and decay; they form the complex bodies (as contrasted to the celestial, which are simple) that serve as the tools for the souls connected with them. Such is the outline of the fragments of "The Book of Substances"; it is to be noticed here that besides some few references to Aristotle, who is called simply "the Philosopher," there are no other quotations.

TRANSLATION OF THE FRAGMENTS

THE BOOK OF SUBSTANCES COLLECTED FROM THE SAYINGS AND TEXTS OF THE ANCIENTS BY THE ACCOMPLISHED MASTER THE PHYSICIAN ABU YAC'QUB ISAAC THE SON OF SOLOMON, THE ISRAELITE,
GOD'S MERCY AND BLESSING UPON HIM

In the name of God the Merciful and Compassionate, Oh God, assist us.

A question put by a certain dialectician, explained and clarified by the physician Isaac, son of Solomon, the Israelite, concerning the substance which is generic in reality and that which is generic by way of metaphor and relation. This is the book better known as the Book of Substances.

The interrogator asked: Why did the Philosopher call the simple substance genus of the compound substance, while both of them are species of the first substance which is the genus of genera, and he has postulated in the book of logic that the species are divided under their genera in an equal way, without that one should precede the other, or have precedence over the other in receiving the name of genus exclusively, or that one should be superior to the other, or that it should be said . . .

(Lacuna—a page, or some pages, missing)

[The form of nature, which establishes its essence] is brought into being from the shade (*fay'*) of the vegetative soul and its ray (*shu'ā'*).

The form of the vegetative soul and its specificity (*naw'iyya*) is brought into being from the shade of the animal soul and its ray. The form of the animal soul and its specificity is brought into being from the shade of the rational soul. The form of the rational soul is brought into being from the shade of intellect. Thus it is evident that the ray and shade of intellect are the specificity of the rational soul, the ray and shade of the rational soul are the specificity of the animal soul, the ray and shade of the animal soul are the specificity of the vegetative soul, the ray and shade of the vegetative soul are the specificity of nature. This being so, intellect is the specificity of all substances and the form that establishes their essence, as its ray and light, which emanates (*munba'ith*) from its shade, are the fountain of their substantiality (*jawhariyya*), and the root of their forms and specificity.

Someone may say: Why do you not add that power and will (*al-qudra wa'l-irāda*) is the specificity of all substances, as it is power and will that brings into being wisdom, which is the intellect's form and specificity and that which perfects its essence. The answer is as follows: You have made an absurd objection, because you have compared an influencing and acting thing (*shay' atharī fi'lī*) to one essential (*jawharī dhātī*). The light of wisdom is brought into being from power and will by way of influence and action (*al-ta'thīr wa'l-fi'l*), while the light which emanates from intellect is essential (*dhātī jawharī*), like the light and shining of the sun, which emanates from its essence and substantiality (*dhātihā wa-jawhariyya-tihā*). Specific form is not brought into being from an influencing and acting thing, but from an essential one—like reason (*nuṭq*) which establishes the essence of man, and which does not come from soul in the way of influence and action, but is essential.

Having reached this point in our discourse, let us return and continue with the discussion of our subject. When the nature of the sphere and the other heavenly bodies was established, and they executed their perfect and simple circular movement, from their movement there came into being a warmth which combined with matter (*hayūlā*) and spread out in it. Matter contracted itself (*inbasat*) for it, and the spherical power, which was appointed by its Creator (*qaddarahā bārī'uhā*) for influencing (*ta'thīr*) coming-to-be and passing-away, accompanied it. From this there came into being the nature of the four elements (*'unṣur*), viz., fire, air, water, and earth. Its light is the least bright one and that farthest removed

from spirituality ; for the reason that it is at the farthest distance from the true light and pure brilliance, as it merely receives its light from the vegetative soul. For this reason its light is weak and its powers are dispersed and the matter which carries it acquires the formation of body (*tajassum*) and receives length, width, and depth. It executes the perfect and simple circular movement. For this reason the Philosopher says that the word nature has various meanings. It is applied to the sphere and the other heavenly bodies, as they are a fifth nature, effecting coming-to-be and passing-away ; as the Philosopher has said : Nature is the beginning of movement and rest, meaning by movement coming-to-be, and by rest passing-away. Nature is also applied to the qualities, viz. warmth, coldness, moisture, and dryness, because these are the qualities and simple natures of things. For this reason everything possessing nature (*maṭbū'*) is either warm, or cold, or moist, or dry. Nature is also applied to the elements (*'unṣur*), viz., fire, air, water, and earth, because these are the natures and elements (*uṣṭuquṣṣ*) of things. It is also applied to the mixtures of the bodies (*jirm*), composed of the elements, viz., the bodies of animals and plants. Nature in reality, however, is the spheric power appointed by its Creator to influencing coming-to-be and passing-away.

Someone may object and say : What is the proof to show that the first created things (*al-mukhtara'āt*) are two simple substances and that intellect is brought into being from them ? We answer : Indeed, you have asked a question which ought not be neglected, even without your asking. Nevertheless, we prefer to postpone the answer for the present, until we finish the subject which we have begun ; after that, we shall quote the necessary proofs, which are clear and which do not come under the head of possibility or rhetorical conviction (*iqnā'*), but under the head of necessity and compulsiveness. We have explained and made clear that from nature and its specificity, which establish . . . (Here ends MS. No. 1243 ; the continuation contained in the pages discovered by Borisov is not available. The subject-matter of the immediate continuation can, however, be recovered from Borisov's analysis : the derivation from nature of the elements and the compound substances—cf. Analysis, (f). On this follows—though not certain if immediately—the proof that the first created beings are form and matter ; the British Museum MS. sets it in the middle of the discussion of this subject.)

... was sitting during the night, a shining candle before him, and afterwards the candle was taken away—would not find more than the absence (*'adam*) of light. In the same way, if water enters into someone's eye, he does not find that anything happens beyond the absence of his sight. If he says: Is not the entrance of water something which is in being, we answer: its entrance is not a form for the absence of sight, but one of the causes that bring it about; as for blindness, it has no form, because it is the absence of sight. Secondly, if ignorance were an essential form, it would preserve the nature of matter and perfect its light and brilliance, and, like soul, which preserves the nature of the body ignorance is the absence of all these things. Thirdly, if ignorance were an essential form, man, when ignorance was raised from him, would lack soul, and an animal would claim soul with better right, because ignorance belongs more properly to it. Thus it is clear that intellect is neither a material substance (*jawhar 'unṣurī*) for soul nor a formal substance (*jawhar ṣūrī*). If intellect were a form for the soul, it could not leave it, because the departure of the essential form implies the passing-away of the thing for which it is a form; for instance, reason, the departure of which implies the disappearance of man. Soul, however, is not like that, because . . . always . . . learns and teaches action. Thus it is clear that intellect is neither a material nor formal substance for the soul. It remains therefore a substance composed of matter (*hayūlā*) and form, as the division of intellect has been carried out and no fourth possibility remains. Thus intellect is composed of matter and form. Now it is clear that matter precedes it; thus it is clear that the created things are two simple substances and that intellect comes into being from them.

Having reached this point in our discourse and having accomplished our aim, which was to prove that the created things were two simple substances, let us return to the subject which [is the difference of the substances and the precedence of one substance to another, in their spirituality and rank⁹]. . . . [The lower grades of emanation are less perfect] and this for three reasons. First, the quality of the emanation (*inbi'āth*) of the light which is created from power and will. Secondly, the quality of the reception of light by some of the substances from the others. Thirdly, the

⁹ The lacunæ in the text can be filled in with the help of BORISOV's quotation from the corresponding passages in the Leningrad manuscript.

difference existing between that which bestows and that which is bestowed, the bestowing and the reception of the bestowal.¹⁰ What regards the quality of the emanation of the light from the power and will, we have already established that its beginning is different from its end, and the middle from both ends, and this for the reason which follows: when its beginning was emanated from power and will, it met no shadows of darkness, so that it should become dim and coarse, while its end was met by various imperfections which made it dim and coarse. . . .

(The contents of the remaining portion extant in the Leningrad MS. is not given in Borisov's analysis.)

¹⁰ This passage is quoted from the Leningrad MS. in BORISOV's analysis, and this correspondence is a conclusive proof—if such is needed—that the British Museum MS. belongs to the *Book of Substances*.

THE ORIGINAL TEXT

<p>כתאב אלגואהר ממא עני בנמעה מן אקאיל אלגואיל ונצוצה אלאסתאד אלכאמל אבו יעקוב אסחק בן סלימאן אלאסראילי אלמתטבב רחמה אללה עליה ורצואנה</p>	<p>Len. 1r 5</p>
<p>בסם אללה אלרחמן אלרחים אללהם אען מסלה לבעץ אלגדליין ממא עני בשרחה ותכלף באיצאחהא אסחק בן סלימאן אלאסראילי אפילסוף פי אלגוהר אלגנסי עלי אלחקיקה ואלגנסי עלי אלמנאז ואלאצאפה והו כתאבה אלמשהור בכתאב אלגואהר. קאל אלסאיל למא צייר אפילסוף אלגוהר אלבסיט גסא לגוהר אלמרכב והמא גמיעא נועאן לגוהר אלגואיל אלדי הו גס אלגנאס וקד שרט פי כתאב אלמנטק אן אלגנאע תנקסם תחת אנאסהא אנקסאמא מתסאויא לא יתקדם בעצהא בעצא ולא יסבקה פי קבול אסם אלגנסי וחדה ולא יעלו אחדהמא אלאכר ולא יקאל</p>	<p>1v 10 15</p>
<p>לדאתהא מכוונה מן פי אלנפס אלנבאטייה ושעאעהא וצורה אלנפס אלנבאטייה ונועיתהא מכוונה מן פי אלנפס אלחיואנייה ושעאעהא וצורה אלנפס אלחיואנייה ונועיתהא מכוונה מן פי אלנפס אלנאטקה וצורה אלנפס אלנאטקה מכוונה מן פי אלעקל פמן אלבין אדא אן שעאע אלעקל ופיה הו נועייה אלנפס אלנאטקה ושעאע אלנפס אלנאטקה ופיהא נועייה אלנפס אלחיואנייה ושעאע אלנפס אלחיואנייה ופיהא נועייה אלנפס אלנבאטייה ושעאע אלנפס אלנבאטייה ופיהא נועייה אלטביעה פאד דלך כדלך פאלעקל אדן נועייה גמיע אלגואהר וצורתהא אלמקומה לדאתהא אד כאן שעאעה ונודה אלמנבעת מן פיה ינבוע גוהריתהא ואצל צורהא ונועיתהא. פאן קאל קאיל פלם לא קלת איצא אן אלקדרה ואלאראדה נועייה כל אלגואהר אד כאנת הי אלמכוונה ללחכמה אלתי הי צורה אלעקל ונועיתהא אלמתממה לדאתהא. קלנא לה עארצת במחאל לאנך קאבלת שיא אתריא</p>	<p>2v 5 10 15</p>

1r., line 6. The title page contains also an ex-libris (ל) שמואל [] and some words which I could not decipher. D)

1v., line 15. MS. תתקדם

line 16. MS. תסבקה

2v., line 1. Fol. 2v comes before 2r.

line 2. MS. אלנעת אן conj., אלנפס

- 2r פעליא בגוהרי דאתי ודלך אן נור אלחכמה
מכוון מן אלקדרה ואלארודה עלי סביל אלתאתיר
20 ואלפעל ואלנור אלמנבעת מן אלעקל דאתי גוהרי
כנור אלשמס וציאהא אלמנבעת מן דאתהא וגוהריתהא
ואלצורה אלנועייה פליסת תכון מן אלשי אלתתירי אלפעלי
בל מן אלדאתי אלגוהרי כאלנטק אלמקוום לדאת
אלאנסאן וליס הו מן אלנפס עלי סביל אלתתיר ואלפעל
25 לכנה גוהרי דאתי ואד צרנא אלי הדא אלמוצע
מן כלאמנא פלנרנע אלי תמאם אלמעני אלדי כנא
פיה פנקול אנה למא קאמת טביעה אלפלך וסאיר
אלאשכאץ אלעאליה ותחרכת אלחרכה אלדוריה אלתאמה
אלבסיטה תכוון מן חרכתהא חרורה רכבת אלהיולא
30 ואנתשרת פיה ואנבסט אלהיולא להא
וצחבתהא אלקוה אלפלכיה אלתי קדרהא
באריהא לתאתיר אלכון ואלפסאד ותכון מן דלך טביעה
אלענאצר אלד אלתי הי אלנאר ואלהוא ואלמא ואלארץ
3r וכאן נורהא איצא אקל אלנאור ציא ואבעדהא מן
35 אלרוחאניה דלך לאנהא פי אבעד בעד מן אלנור אלחך
ואלציא אלכאלץ אד כאנת אנמא תקבל נורהא מן
אלנפס אלנבאתיה ולדלך צעף נורהא ותפרקת קואהא
ואכתסב אלהיולא אלחאמל לה תגסמא וקבל אלטול
ואלערץ ואלעמק ויתחרך אלחרכה אלדוריה אלתאמה
40 אלבסיטה ומן אגל דלך קאל אלפילסוף אן אלטביעה
תקאל עלי מעאני שתי ודלך אנהא תקאל עלי אלפלך
וסאיר אלאשכאץ אלעאליה אד כאנת טביעה כאמסה פאעלה
ללכון ואלפסאד כמא קאל אלפילסוף אן אלטביעה אבתדא
חרכה וסכון אראד באלחרכה אלכון ובאלסכון
45 אלפסאד. ואלטביעה איצא תקאל אלי אלכיפיאת אעני אלחרורה
ואלברודה ואלרטובה ואליוססה לאנהא כיפיאת אלאשיא
וטבאייעהא אלבסאיט ולדלך צאר כל מטבוע לא יכלו
מן אן יכון אמא חארא ואמא בארדא ואמא רטבא
3r ואמא יאבסא ויקאל איצא עלי אלענאצר אעני אלנאר
50 ואלהוא ואלמא ואלארץ לאנהא טבאייע אלאשיא ואסטקסאתהא
ויקאל איצא עלי מואנאת אלנאראם אלמרכבה מן
אלענאצר אעני אנאראם אלחיואן ואלנבאת אלא אן
אלטביעה עלי אלחקיקה הי אלקוה אלפלכיה אלתי קדרהא
באריהא לתאתיר אלכון ואלפסאד. ולעל מעתרצא יעתרץ ויקול
55 ומא אלדליל עלי אן אול אלמכתרעאת גוהראן בסיטאן
ואן אלעקל מכוון מנהמא פנקול לעמרי לקד עארצת במא לא
יגב אלתנאפל ענה ולו לם יכן מנך פיה מעארצת גיר אנא ראינא
אן נהמל אלכלאם פיה פי וקתנא הדא אלי אן יסתתם אלמעני אלדי
אבתדאנא בה תם נאתי בעד דלך במא יגב מן אלדליל אלואצחה

line 32. MS. ויכון.

line 45. MS. אעלי, אעני.

line 56. MS. אלפעל, אלעקל.

60 אלכארגה ען באב אלאמכאן ואלאקנאע אלדאכלה פי באב
אלוגוב ואלאצטראר וקד כנא ביינא ואוצחנא אן
צורה אלטביעה ונועיתהא אלמקומה

Brit. וכאן גאלסא פי אלליל ובין ידיה שמעה תצי תם
Mus רפעת אלשמעה למא וגד שיא חדת אכתר מן עדם
fol. אלנור. וכדלך לו אן אנסאן גול פי עינה מא למא וגד
8r שיא חדת אכתר מן עדם בצרה. פאן

קאל אפליס גוול אלמא מוגודא קלנא לה אן
[גזולה לים הו צורה לעדם אלבצר לכנה אחד אסבאבה אלמוגבה
לתכונה ואמא אלעמא פלא צורה לה לאנה עדם אלבצר
ואלתאני אן אלגהל לו כאן צורה גוהריה לכאן חאפלטא]
לטביעה אליהולא ומתמא לנורה וצ[א]ה ומתל אלנפס
אלח[א]פטה לטביעה אלגסם [גוהריה]

8v [גוהריה פעדם] ואלגהל פעדם
דלך אנמע. ואלתאלת אן אלגהל לו כאן צורה גוהריה לכאן
אלאנסאן אדא ארתפע ענה אלגהל עדם אלנפס וצארת
אלבהימה אשד תחקקא מנה באלנפס לאנהא אכץ באלגהל.
פקד באן אן אלעקל לים בגוהר עוצרי ללנפס ולא הו איצי
בגוהר צורי להא מן קבל אן אלעקל לו כאן צורה ללנפס למא
אמכן ארתפאעה ענהא לאן בארתפאע אלצורה אלגוהריה פסאד
מא הו לה צורה מתל אלנטק אלדי בארתפאעה ארתפאע אלאנסאן
ואלנפס פליסט כדלך לאנא [הא אבדא] תתעלם
פועלם [הא אבדא]

9r פועל וקד טהר אדא אן אלעקל לים בגוהר
עוצרי ללנפס ולא צורי פקד בקי גוהר מרכב מן היולא וצורה
אד קד כרגת קסמה אלעקל אלי אלפעל ולם יבק וגה
ראבע יוצרף אליה אדא צאר אלעקל מרכבא מן היולא
וצורה פמן אלבין אן אליהולא קדם מנה באלטבע פקד באן
אן אלמכתרעאת גוהראן בסיטאן ואן אלעקל מכון מנהמא.
ואד צרנא אלי הדא אלמוצע מן כלאמנא ואתינא עלי.
מא ארדנא איצאחה מן אקאמה אלדליל עלי אן אלמכתרע[את
גוהר]אן בסיטאן פלנרגע [א]ל[י] מא כנא [הא אבדא]

9v אן דלך לתלת אסבאב. אחדאא כיפיה אנבעאת אלנור
אלמכתרע מן אלקדרה ואלאראדה. ואלב כיפיה ק[בול] אלגוהר
ללנור בעצהא מן בעץ ואל[ג] אלאכתלאף אלואקע בין אלמפיד
[אלמפאד ואלאפאדה ואלאסטפאדה אמא כיפיה אנבעאת אלנור
מן אלקדרה ואלאראדה פקד כנא אוצחנא ובינא אן אולה
מכאלף לאכרה ואלולסט מן . . . אלחאשיה מן קבל אן אולה
כמא אנבעת מן אלקדרה ואלאראדה למ יערצה צל ולא אלטלאם
פיכדר ויגלט ואכרה פקד אעתרצהא אפאת . . . שתא
[כדרתה] וגלטתה מן [הא אבדא]

S. M. STERN.

Oxford.

GNOSTIC DOCTRINES IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY JEWISH MYSTICISM*

The gnostic character of the main trends of the medieval Jewish mysticism, known as Kabbalah, is now a well-known and well-established fact, thanks to the researches of Professor Scholem. These gnostic traits are most prominent in the Kabbalah of the *Zohar*, which was written in Spain in the thirteenth century, and in the Kabbalah of Rabbi Isaac Luria, who lived in the city of Safed in the sixteenth century. These systems exhibit gnostic traits in the whole field of theology: in their doctrines of God, creation, evil, man, salvation, and redemption. They amount, in fact, to a gnostic transformation of Judaism.

But until now no attempt has been made to elaborate a systematic comparison between gnostic Kabbalah and ancient Gnosticism. Such a comparison may be of interest not only to students of Jewish mysticism, but also for those of Gnosticism in general. Here we have the development of a gnostic movement at a late period, and in a religious and cultural environment entirely different from that prevailing in the early centuries of the Christian era. The gnostic Kabbalah appears to have come into being without significant influence from ancient Gnosticism and there is certainly no reason to assume any historical connection between Lurianic Kabbalism and Gnosticism proper or its offshoots. Yet in Lurianic Kabbalism we see before us a broad pattern of mythical Gnosis which, in its structure and tendencies, comes very close to Manicheism. The mere fact of the existence of a late gnostic-manicheistic system in Judaism might well invalidate the assumption prevalent in many studies on the subject that the growth of Gnosticism can only be understood as the result of the collision and coalescence of pagan mythological with monotheistic religions.

Within the limits of this paper I cannot attempt to outline the whole intricate system of Lurianic Kabbalah. It is described in Scholem's *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem, 1941; New York, 1946) and a more detailed analysis is given in my

* Paper read at the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 1955.

Hebrew book on the doctrine of evil and the so-called "shell" in Lurianic Kabbalah.¹ Here I must confine myself to the comparative elucidation of two principal ideas. But I hope that even such a short and fragmentary treatment will demonstrate the gnostic-manichean character of the Lurianic system. The two ideas with which I shall deal are the doctrines of the "Breaking of the Vessels" and the "Fall of the Sparks."

The establishment of the divine worlds, which are a kind of gnostic æons, is described by Luria as the flowing of light from parts of the head of the upper primal man (*Adam Kadmon*), the first divine configuration, into emanated vessels. During the last phase of this process, in the erection of the lowest of the divine worlds, a mishap occurred. The vessels which had been prepared in this phase broke, while the lights intended for them poured into them. Instead of construction there was destruction and the intended completion of the divine cosmos turned into chaos.²

This daring myth of the breaking of the vessels, which tells of an upheaval within the divine domain, is an innovation in kabbalistic lore. Nor do we find a parallel to it in Gnosticism. But in considering its essential meaning, the gnostic character of this event becomes apparent. The breaking of the vessels represents a crisis in the divine life which disturbed the original harmony and diverted the intended development from its path so that it now oscillates between destruction and restoration, descent and ascent. Such a critical turn of events, in some form or other, is an organic part of every gnostic myth. The crisis occurs almost always at the transition from theogony to cosmogony. The principal tendency of this conception is to represent the non-divine cosmos and especially the material world as the outcome of convulsion and decline, as a defective and unstable building erected on chaos. This tendency is very marked in Lurianic Kabbalah. The breaking of the vessels can therefore be regarded as an original variation on a well-known gnostic theme.

In Gnosticism itself we find different versions on this theme. However, as regards the principal accounts of the origin of the crisis, the variety of versions can be reduced to a few basic types. Jonas³ distinguished two such types. The one explains the crisis in

1 I. TISHBY: תורת דרז והקליפה בקבלת האר"י, Jerusalem, 1952.

2 The divine world in which the breach occurred is named "world of chaos" (עולם החרוז). See TISHBY, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

3 H. JONAS, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, vol. I (Göttingen, 1934), pp. 267, 280-283.

terms of a sin, committed by some divine force ; that is to say, the impulse that resulted in the upheaval arose in the divine realm itself. The second type attributes the crisis to an outside factor, a force of darkness and evil which assailed the kingdom of light and brought calamity upon it. The first type includes almost all systems of Christian Gnosticism. The second type is most clearly manifested in Manicheism.

Is it possible to attach the crisis of the breaking of the vessels to one of these two types ?

As for the first type, we may note that a parallel to the gnostic original sin is found in kabbalistic literature prior to the *Zohar* and it appears in the form of an interpretation of a Talmudic saying about the relations between sun and moon. According to the Talmudic legend,⁴ originally the two luminaries were equal, but after the moon complained that "two kings cannot share one crown" and demanded a higher rank, it was decreed that she lessen herself and step down to a lower position. The *Zohar* transferred this legend symbolically to the divine Sephiroth. The *Shekhinah*, the last Sephirah in female form (corresponding to Sophia in Gnosticism and symbolised by the moon), demanded a separate domain, independent of her husband, the Sephirah *Tifereth*, Beauty, symbolised by the sun. As a punishment for her arrogance she was forced to lessen herself and to step down from her position. Here we have a close parallel to the fall of Sophia as a result of sin, except that the *Zohar* does not describe the lessening of the moon as a descent beyond the confines of the sephirothic world. The processes of the creation of the world and of its fall into the domain of *ṣitra aḥra*, the "Other Side," the realm of evil and darkness, are not directly bound up with the lessening of the moon but are connected with the sin of the first man. In Lurianic Kabbalah the lessening of the moon occurred after the breaking of the vessels, while in connection with the breaking itself there is no mention of sin.

The crisis of the breaking of the vessels differs also from the Manichean type, since for Luria the "Other Side" had no separate existence before the breaking. Therefore the crisis can certainly not be attributed to an attack on the divine forces by an outside foe.

Luria's main explanation of the breaking refers to the prior

4 T. B. HULLIN, 60b.

existence of the root of evil within the divine vessels themselves.⁵ This root existed from of old in the recesses of *En Soph*, the hidden Deity. During the process of emanation it was transmitted downwards from phase to phase and became stronger and more concentrated until in the last phase it was so concentrated within the vessels that the tension between it and the divine lights caused breaking and destruction.⁶

This explanation shows that Lurianic Kabbalism knows an original form of crisis, which occupies an intermediate place between the two types mentioned above. The crisis took place within the Deity. It was the outcome of a collision between the forces of good and evil because in the Deity itself an opposing duality existed.

In the second doctrine, that of the fall of the sparks, we find even more striking agreement with ancient Gnosticism. This process and some moments in it appear like a repetition of Manichean lore.⁷

According to Lurianic Kabbalah, splinters of the vessels and sparks of divine light which still adhered to them fell outside the divine domain as a result of the breaking. These splinters and sparks intermingled with the dross, *i.e.*, the forces of evil and darkness thrown off in the act of breaking. The splinters of the vessels, described also as "kings,"⁸ lay as dead in the non-divine space. Hence it became incumbent upon the Deity to separate good from evil and to repair the destruction; or, in a different image, to resurrect the dead kings. This act was performed by the emanation of a new light from the Primal Man which brought the kings to life by cleansing the splinters of the dross, fitting them together, and lifting them up to their original place. Out of the inferior parts of the fallen splinters, which even after their separation from evil were not worthy to be raised into the divine domain, the non-divine cosmos was created.

⁵ [scil. מאמרי רשב" (ירושלים, תרנ"ח) פקודין דף ל"ג ע"ב: "כי להיותם (הכלים) שנשברו . . . דינים קשים היה הפסולת של הקליפות מעורב בהם, וכאשר נזקקו נימשה חוברו ונתקמו . . . והפסולת שבהם נעשה ממנו בדינת הקליפות ונשארו הם למשה," עץ חיים, שער י"א, פרק ה' "ושבירתן [של הכלים] זו היא מדרתן, כי אז נתבררו הוהמא והסיגים שבהם ונעשו קליפות הם השומאות,"

⁶ See TISHBY, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-43, 47-49, 52-59.

⁷ For the Manichean myth and doctrine see F. C. BURKITT, *The Religion of the Manichees* (Cambridge, 1925); H. J. POLOTSKY, art. Manichäismus (*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband VI, cols. 240-271); H. C. PUECH, *Le Manichéisme* (Paris, 1949).

⁸ עץ חיים, שער י"ח פרק א: ח"ס [= וזה סוד] והארץ היתה תהו ובהו שהם בדינת המלכים הנקרא על שם המלכות דא"ק [= דאדם קדמון] הנקרא ארץ אדום, אשר מתו ונתהברו ונעשו תהו ובהו."

But the process of purification was not completed with these acts. Out of the root of evil, thrown off from the Deity in the form of dross, originated the "Other Side." This demonic power entrenched itself in the depth of the abyss, erected there a reign of darkness, and even "took booty" by capturing splinters and divine sparks. Moreover, it broke out from its domain and erected outposts in the vicinity of the worlds that were created in the process of purification, and even penetrated into them. The completion of the restoration therefore necessitated the removal of the demonic forces from the worlds and the lifting up of the captured sparks. This task requires the active participation of man. Its completion will bring about final redemption.⁹

This short description suffices to show that in the account of what follows the breaking, Lurianic myth closely resembles Manichean myth. Moreover, in Lurianic Kabbalah as well as in Manicheism the lifting up of the sparks is considered the principal function of the Righteous. According to Luria, the *Zaddikim* are capable of carrying out this work even in such everyday activities as eating.¹⁰

We find, of course, not only resemblance but also divergency in important aspects, some of which may be noted here in order to convey a correct impression of the nature of this Jewish variant of "Manicheism" which came into being without any contact with the teachings of Mani.

One of the decisive differences lies in the way creation and the fate of the first man are conceived. In contrast to the demonic origin attributed to Adam in Manichean thought, according to which he was created by the forces of darkness to serve as a prison for the particles of divine light in their possession, Lurianic Kabbalah describes Adam as a superior being created by the holy Sephiroth and destined to fight the demonic forces and free the captured sparks from their prison. While according to Manicheism Adam was elevated from his low estate and escaped from the dominion of darkness with the help of a divine messenger or redeemer, Lurianic Kabbalah teaches that Adam failed in his mission, and yielding to the seduction of the "Other Side," submitted himself to its rule.¹¹ Thus we have here on this important point an extreme contrast between the two systems.

⁹ See TISHBY, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-38, 62ff.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 125-132.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 91-93.

This contrast reflects a difference in attitude towards the Biblical story of Adam. The Manichean description is in direct opposition to that story. In Lurianic Kabbalah, on the other hand, the tendency is to accommodate the Biblical story to the myth of the breaking of the vessels and the fall of the sparks. But even in this contrasting approach we see a close affinity between Lurianic Kabbalah and Manicheism. Adam, prior to his sin, is described in Lurianic Kabbalah as a spiritual and cosmic being, whose failure caused a second crisis and a kind of repetition of the disaster of the breaking. The result was a further fall of sparks of divine lights and of the souls contained within Adam into the abyss of the "Other Side."¹² Here we have a description of the crisis similar to the Manichean story about the mission and failure of the Primal Man, except that in Lurianic Kabbalah this event represents a second crisis which occurred after creation and that the defeated messenger is not a divine Primal Man but a created man.

Another important difference between the two systems concerns the balance of power after the conclusion of the cosmogonic drama. According to Mani's teaching, a second round took place in the battle between the forces of light and darkness, and in this second stage the Primal Man succeeded, after his release and recovery, in defeating the enemies and enslaving them. In Lurianic Kabbalah the "Other Side" gained the upper hand also at the second stage of its fight with Adam. That is to say, Lurianic Kabbalah expresses a more pessimistic view of the existing state of the world than Manicheism does. According to the Manichean system the forces of darkness were defeated and chained already before creation and only the intermingling of good and evil, which occurred before the victory of good, is the cause of the existence of evil in the world and necessitates restoration. Lurianic Kabbalah teaches that the "Other Side" still exists in all its vigour and its existence entails constant danger.

We may assume that this divergence is rooted in different assumptions about the coming of the Messiah. Mani, in spite of his

ספר הקלוקסים (ירושלים, תרע"ג), עקב, דף נ"ו ע"א: "והבן סוד החסא [של אדם הראשון], כ' נגע עד 12 למעלה ראש בהיותו ס"בה להשליך ניצוצות הקדושה במקום התהו . . . וחמא אדה"ר [= אדם הראשון] מנע הכל, ואדרבא הוסיף ניצוצ' קדושה בין החיצונים, ולא די שלא העלה אותם למקומם . . . אלא שהוסיף רעה על רעה." שער הפסוקים (ירושלים, תרע"ב), בראשית, דף ג' ע"ב: "והענין הוא כי תחלה היה [אדם הראשון scil.] כלול מכל הנשמות שבכל שחא אל"ף שני דהוי' עלמא כנוי וכלם היו אנרים פריסם שבו, ונשחמא נסתלקו ממנו כי שלמה בו הקליפה ונשבעו כל תוך הקליפות." See also TISHBY, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-105.

distance from Christian theology, accepted the belief that a divine redeemer had already been active in the world in defeating Satan. This view has no place in Lurianic Kabbalah, which denied the advent of the Messiah in the past and considered redemption only in eschatological terms.

The third difference concerns the concept of redemption at the end of days. Manicheism believed in the complete redemption of the particles of the divine light and in the immunity of the kingdom of light from any harm for all time, but despaired of restoring this world and prophesied its utter destruction. As for the forces of evil, they were to continue their existence in their enclosed domain. Lurianic Kabbalah, on the other hand, describes redemption as the total annihilation of the "Other Side"¹³ and the restoration of this world and its eventual elevation from corporeality to spirituality.

In this respect, therefore, Lurianic Kabbalah expresses a more optimistic approach than Manicheism. In spite of its tendency towards extreme dualism, and in spite of its negative attitude to this world, which led it to advocate the ascetic life, it retained in its messianic message an optimistic note echoing the view of early Jewish Messianism.

Jerusalem—Oxford.

I. TISHBY.

מבא שצירם, שער ז' חלק ב' פרק א': "ונאשר יכלו להתברר כל הקדושה שבתיכם ולא נשארו רק 13
הסיגים הם הקליפות בלתי תערובת קדושה כלל לנמר אפילו כמו כחוש השערה, או' כתיב 'בלע המות לנצח'
' והרשעה כלה בעשן חלה', כי או הסיגים הנשארים תוך הכלים הנשברים הם 'שארו בלתי שום חיות
See TISHBY, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-143. רמותו לנמר ויתבשל",

LONDON YIDDISH LETTERS OF THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (1)

A. INTRODUCTION

1. THE MSS.

The nine Yiddish letters which are being published here for the first time in their original version, with annotations, are contained, together with an amount of miscellaneous material, in the Harley collection (Harley 7013) in the British Museum. The letters have been described by G. Margoliouth in his *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London, 1915, part III, section 9, No. 1049. Margoliouth's description requires some correction. In the first place, he has not numbered the letters in their chronological order, which may cause some confusion. I would therefore suggest the following changes:

MARGOLIOUTH	CHANGE
Letter No. 4 (from 1703)	to become No. 1
„ 3 („ 1713 and subsequent dates)	„ 2
„ 2	„ 3
„ 1	„ 4
„ 5	„ 5
„ 6	„ 6
„ 7	„ 7
„ 9	„ 8
„ 8	„ 9

Secondly, Margoliouth describes the fourth letter (our No. 1) as having been written in the year תפ"ג=1723, which is not correct. The actual date is תס"ג=1703, the time when R. Aaron ben Moses Sofer (see below) lived in Dublin. The third letter (our No. 2) was not dated תע"ה=1715, but the 7th Shevat תע"ג=1713. Finally, the ninth letter (our No. 8) is addressed to פיים=Feys, and not as Margoliouth erroneously read: חיים.

2. THE LETTERS

The letters which once belonged to the famous collection of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, shared the fate of many of their kind, in that they failed to reach their destination. They may have been intercepted or lost on the way and have thus fortunately been preserved for posterity. They reveal an interesting exchange of

correspondence which went on between London and Dublin at an earlier date, and later between Holland and London over a period of eleven years, the first letter having been written in 1703 and the last by the middle of 1714.

They are private letters of an intimate character, often hurriedly written in the ordinary Yiddish vernacular of Dutch Jews. They are essentially personal notes with a domestic touch, which throw additional light upon the living conditions, occupations, family relations, troubles, and joys of Ashkenazi Jews in London and in Holland in the early part of the eighteenth century. Some of the letters were written by scholarly men who used a flourishing, rhetorical, rabbinical style with quotations from the Bible adorned by talmudical sayings. The correspondents, even the women and the unlearned, are well versed in the requisites of Hebrew letter-writing. They gracefully used the accepted Hebrew formulas for titles and greetings at the beginning and the closing phrases at the end of the letter, including the ban of R. Gershom ben Judah directed against the unauthorised opening of correspondence addressed to others. Most of the letters, however, employ a more popular style of writing, often rough and incoherent with numerous repetitions, reminiscent rather of the spoken than of the written word. With few exceptions, the writing is often careless and haphazard, with occasional mistakes and misspellings. Yet beneath all this, one feels a natural warmth and personal colour, a freshness of feeling and directness of expression mixed with tender concern and a human quality.

3. TIME AND CONDITIONS

While in England Ashkenazi Jews are to be found only in the early part of the second half of the seventeenth century, Jews from Germany had already settled in Holland at an earlier date, in all probability in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. Throughout the period of the Thirty Years War (1618-48) there was a continuous influx of German Jews to Holland. Jews of East European extraction arrived in England apparently about the same time as in Holland. There is an account, Cecil Roth¹ tells us, "of the arrival in London in 1648 or 1649 of a whole shipload of Polish Jewish refugees" who had fled from the horrors of the Cossack

¹ CECIL ROTH, *The Great Synagogue, London, 1690-1940*, London, 1950, p. 2.

uprising under Chmielnicki (1648-49). Under similar conditions hundreds of Polish Jews had fled to Amsterdam.² They were the tragic survivors of the Cossack massacres, trying to escape from immeasurable sufferings, persecution, and starvation. The majority of these refugees were poverty stricken men and women, who were for a time dependent on communal charity. Some of them soon found employment as rabbis, teachers, cantors, shochetim, beadles, etc., in the service of the community. Others sought employment in private service. A poor Ashkenazi Jew in Amsterdam "would hire himself out as servant; sometimes he was employed as a messenger or menial worker by a rich Portuguese merchant."³

A great deal of information about the conditions of life of some of these Jews in London and in Holland, their poverty and occupations, their social position, and marriages can be derived from these letters. We hear of professional scribes unable to earn a living from their irksome work who tried to add to their incomes by match-making. We also hear of dowries ranging between 30 and 50 pounds sterling or of 500 florins in Holland. This would suggest that some of the families mentioned in the letters were not resourceless, petty traders of no social standing. On the other hand, we are also told of many a young Jew who is seeking employment in London or emigrating to Dutch possessions in the West Indies and of Jewish girls from Holland employed in domestic service in the houses of rich London Jews. Naturally, not only Jewish girls flocked to London to find domestic positions. In 1753 John Fielding speaks of the "amazing number of women servants wanting places, though there was always a shortage of maids-of-all-work."

These letters create an impression of regular trade between the various communities, particularly in *ritualia*. We hear of orders for the delivery from London to Rotterdam of skins (parchment) for the writing of Torah scrolls and other ritual accessories, for slaughtering knives to be sent from Amsterdam to London and for other articles such as remnants of material, Hebrew books, etc. The letters throw also some light on the condition of the poor, hard-working Jew in Holland. Thus, for instance, Jehudah ben Menachem of Rotterdam was engaged in writing Mezuzot and Tefillin on orders from R. Aaron in London. Being badly paid for

² HERBERT J. BLOOM, *The Economic Activities of the Jews in Amsterdam in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, 1937, p. 25.

³ BLOOM, *op. cit.*

his scribal work, he had in addition to take to teaching children ; but his position nevertheless remained precarious. One woman correspondent (Reichla, the daughter of R. Jehudah Leib) complained that in her old age she was compelled by poverty to nurse sick people at night.

Letters sometimes provide information of a more general nature. Thus, in No. 2, there is the story of a priest in Bamberg (Germany) who was involved in a controversy concerned with the tenets of the Christian religion. In one of his sermons he is said to have uttered words of ridicule and blasphemy against the person of Jesus and maintained that the only true religion was the Jewish one. As he refused to withdraw his blasphemous remarks, he had been tortured and burnt alive. Whether the story related here is true or fictitious is difficult to ascertain. The Vatican Library has no record of it. In the recorded history of the Diocese of Bamberg (comp. J. Looshorn, *Geschichte des Bistums Bamberg nach den Quellen bearbeitet*, Bamberg, 1903-36, particularly Vol. VI, dealing with the period 1623-1729) no mention of such an event could be found.

4. THE CORRESPONDENTS

(a) The first and most outstanding personality in this correspondence is undoubtedly Rabbi Aaron ben Moses Sofer (the scribe), to whom most of the letters were addressed. We know that he came from Nowogrodek, in Poland, and was a skilled scribe, "having practised his art under the supervision of no less an authority than Rabbi David haLevi, author of the *Ture Zahav*."⁴ It was in this capacity, maintains Roth, that he first came to England, where he earned his living by writing Torah scrolls and other liturgical accessories. He was also employed by the Earl of Oxford, for whom he had "made some superb copies of Hebrew codices."⁴ At the beginning of the eighteenth century we find him in Dublin, "where a small community established itself . . . attaining momentary prosperity at the close of the seventeenth century."⁵ He subsequently returned to London and lived in Shoemakers Row, Duke's Place. For a short while, during the period of a rabbinical interregnum, he filled the post of rabbi of the Ashkenazi community in London. Being a pupil of the great R. David haLevi, he was in all probability a scholar of some

⁴ CECIL ROTH, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁵ CECIL ROTH, *Anglo-Jewish Letters*, London, 1938, p. 87.

standing. In the letters, R. Aaron is addressed as a great talmudical scholar and most correspondents address him with reverence and great respect; but he was more of a scribe than of a rabbinical authority and Roth^{5a} is probably right in suggesting that "he was hardly of the calibre to serve as spiritual and intellectual leader of the London community." As a respected scholar and rabbi, he was often employed as a match-maker, as were some famous rabbinical authorities before him. According to letter No. 9, R. Aaron was still alive in the year 1714.

(b) The correspondent of letter No. 1, who signs himself as "Jehudah Leib, of Lissa, and temporarily in London," can undoubtedly be identified as R. Jehudah Leib, of Lissa (Poland), a noted scholar, who was "the Hazan or Reader of the Community in 1695-96"⁶ and in 1703 was still living in London. By the year 1713 he was already dead. Later, his son, Jacob London, became "quite a noteworthy figure in Hebrew letters."⁷ From the letters we learn that Jehudah Leib had also a daughter, Reichla by name, who was married to R. Itsik Cohen. Reichla speaks of her father as "Morenu haRav," i.e., the title of a rabbi.

(c) Three letters of our collection were written by this Reichla, the daughter of Jehudah Leib. If we are right in assuming that the letters were written (though no year is inserted in the letters) in 1713 (when R. Aaron was still alive), she was then already a widow after the death of her husband, R. Itsik Cohen, and an elderly person. She took a particular pride in her distinguished family. She was also related by marriage (מחותן) to R. Aaron. At one time she was priding herself on the imposing dowry of 50 pounds sterling which she was giving her son, Mendle. It is difficult, however, to reconcile this generous offer with her statement in another letter depicting in gloomy colours her insecurity and misery in consequence of which she had to take up night nursing of sick people.

(d) Two letters (Nos. 2 and 9) are from Jehudah b. Isaac ב"ק of Amsterdam. Like the former correspondent, he was also related by marriage to R. Aaron and calls him מחותני. He lived in poor circumstances and his daughters were obliged to find places as domestic servants—one of them in London.

(e) Jehudah b. Menachem (letters Nos. 3 and 4) lived in Rotterdam and, like others of the correspondents, in great poverty. He

^{5a} See n. 4. ⁶ CECIL ROTH, *Anglo-Jewish Letters*, London, 1938, p. 29.

⁷ ROTH, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

derived a meagre income as teacher and scribe, working on commission for R. Aaron in London. True to type, he also tried his hand as a marriage broker.

(f) Finally, of Moses b. Meshullam, who lived in Amsterdam, nothing but the name is known. He styles himself "ben haRav Meshullam" and was presumably, therefore, the son of an ordained rabbi. Moses' son, Feys (פייס) lived with his wife, Memle, and their children in London. In his letter (No. 8) a deal in herrings is mentioned.

5. THE FAMILY TABLE

- I. אהרן בן משה סופר
R. Aaron ben Moses Sofer
of Nowogrodek in Poland.
His wife: Rose.
Their daughter: Lea.
Son-in-law: שמשון Shimshon.
- II. ר' יהודה לייב מליסא
R. Jehuda Leib of Lissa.
His daughter: (רייכלה) Reichla.
(His son: Jacob London).
- III. רייכלה בת ר' יהודה לייב
Reichla (bat Jehudah Leib)
(related by marriage to R.
Aaron Sofer).
Husband: R. Itsik Cohen.
ר' איציק כהן
Son: מענדל Mendle.
Daughters:
Mindla (married to
Jedidiah).
Lea (married to
Shimshon).
Zedina (married to
Abraham).

- IV. יהודה בר יצחק כ"ץ
Jehudah b. Isaac, כ"ץ. (related
by marriage to R. Aaron).
Daughters: בלימכה Blimche.
מלאוה Slave.
בריינכה Breinche.
Relative: Leiser of Naarden.
(ליזר פון נערדין)
- יהודה בן מנחם
V. Jehudah ben Menachem.
Stepson: אייזיק Isaac.
Stepdaughter: הענדלע Hendle.
She marries Isaac (אייזיק) the
son of Sarah, wife of R. Itsik
(ר' איציק) of London.
משה בן משלם
VI. Moses ben Meshullam.
Sons: פייס Feys, wife
Mémele (מימלה)
שמעיה Shemaya and
דוד David.
Daughters: טויב Taub, married
Leiser of Narden.
טעלשע Teltsche and
יטכה Yetche.
There is also an uncle שמעיה
Shemaya and his son זעליג,
Selig mentioned.

6. THE CONTENT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE

No. 1. From London to Dublin, Tuesday, 13th Shevat, תש"ב, 1703. R. Jehudah Leib, of Lissa, living temporarily in London, addresses himself to R. Aaron in Dublin to enlist his help in a marriage proposal between the virgin Hena (הנה) of London, and Moses ben Feybus (משה בן פייבש) of Dublin. Since Hena considers R. Aaron her good friend, she is inclined to rely entirely on him and his advice. The correspondent is most anxious to complete the match as soon as possible and therefore he recommends the girl very warmly to his opposite number (and through him probably to

the bridegroom), telling him again what an excellent woman she is, how rich and well-bred. Hena, though an orphan, is not without means. She has a dowry of 30 pounds sterling and more, plenty of clothing and linen.

The English translation of the letter published by Cecil Roth⁸ contains some inaccuracies which should be corrected. The letter starts with the accepted formula: ראשית דבר, יברכהו .e. יר"ד, י"א. "Firstly may God bless you," and continues שנית מהווענן דו הבתולה הנה מיר בוויזן האט נ"ה (גלילות ידו הקדושה), דו מעב"ת איר גוטר פראנד איז אונט מעב"ב ראט איר לשדך את עצמה עם כמ' משה בן כמ' פייבש which should be translated: "Secondly, I beg to inform you that the virgin, Hena, has shown me the letter written by your own hand" here we are again presented with an accepted formula of rabbinical letter-writing, literally: the papers written by your holy hand, "that you are her good friend and that you advise her to be engaged to Moses b. Feybus. . . ." Roth's translation omits the introductory greetings formula at the beginning and proceeds: "Once again I beg to inform you that the young lady, the virgin Hannah, has *requested me to approach her good friend to help her* to conclude her engagement to Moses the son of Feiwei . . ."—a faulty representation of the text. We notice further differences as the translation goes on. In writing about the bride Hena, the correspondent emphasises: דען האט שם טוב בקהילה דו איז מעכטיג גבירותיות אונט חכמה וגם ווישן, נישט אנדרשט כל בני הקהילה איר נישט אנד שט, אז כל טוב נאך צו זאגן כל ימי היותה בכאן "for *she* has a good name in the congregation as a mighty rich woman, full of wisdom and knowledge. No one in the whole congregation has spoken other than good of her all the time since she has been here." Roth, in rendering the text, translates: "for *you* (i.e., R. Aaron) have a good name in the congregation as a man (?) of force (?) and wisdom, and no man has spoken other than good of *you* to *her* since she arrived." We are left with the impression that R. Aaron requires the assurance of *his* good name in the community as this may help considerably in the conclusion of the marriage. There is, in fact, nothing to suggest the need for such an uncalled-for assertion. Apart from that, the text speaks quite clearly of the woman as one "who is mighty rich (lit.: a mighty rich woman) and has wisdom and knowledge," and not of

⁸ CECIL ROTH, *Anglo-Jewish Letters*, London, 1938, p. 87, "An Irish Marriage."

him "as a man of force and wisdom." This does not make sense.

Furthermore, we have: **ובאם ווען ווערט לכא קומין, ווערט זיא** "if he (the bridegroom), however, will come over here, she will produce (lit. send) a deposit." **בטחון** is a deposit provided by the one or the other party concerned in confirmation that the conditions entered upon would be kept. Roth, ignoring the text completely, says: "If, on the other hand, he decides to come, she is *confident* that the matter can be arranged between them to mutual satisfaction." At the end of the letter Roth simply gives the name Judah, without any further indication as to the personality of the writer. It is disappointing that the closing phrase of the letter and the full signature were left out, so that there was no means of identifying the person of the correspondent as R. Jehudah Leib of Lissa (comp. § 5, b).

No. 2. From Amsterdam to London, 7th Shevat תע"ג 1713. There is a gap of ten years in the correspondence. The first letter of the "new" series starts only with the year 1713. Jehudah ben Isaac **ב"ץ** related by marriage to R. Aaron, has been commissioned by the latter to purchase in Amsterdam a rather expensive **חומש** (Pentateuch). We do not know the nature of the book for which the seller, a Portuguese Jew, asked the prohibitive price of 50 florins **נ' זהובים**. (Perhaps we should take them as shillings? Even then, the price for the book might seem to be exceptionally high.) More interesting, however, is the second part of the letter from which we get a glimpse of the social conditions of those days. One of Jehudah's daughters, Blimche (**בלימכה**) is working as a domestic servant in one of London's rich Jewish houses. We have to assume that she has been there already for quite a while as her father would like to know the reason why she left her former employer, Joseph Levy, and in whose employment she is at present and what her earnings are. He asks R. Aaron to keep an eye on the girl and to urge her to go carefully with her money and not to waste it on fineries. He is getting three shirts ready for her which he will soon send over; but life is hard all round. He, Jehudah b. Isaac, is badly off and cannot make a living. The conditions of the Jews in Amsterdam are also not too good. Where a well-to-do person used to employ two maids, he can hardly afford one now. His daughter Breinche (**בריינכה**) is also unemployed. Perhaps she could find some employment in London. Could R. Aaron advise on this? Let him not be afraid lest she become his responsibility. Far it be from him.

Breinche is a brave and handy girl and knows how to work. Their relative, Leiser, of Naarden, is also looking for a job in London. Perhaps Blimche could help here. But Jehudah b. Isaac has also some cheerful news to report. It is of a general nature and important, too. It may warm the heart of the hard-pressed, persecuted Jew. His religion, often ridiculed and abused, has found a brave champion in the person of a priest in Bamberg who was prepared to suffer torture and even death for his convictions. (Comp. § 3.) At the back of the letter a different hand has added in Dutch: "Deesen brieff to bestellen an arent mosesz op schoe maekers au dukx palijs, tot Londen."

We add here a second letter by the same correspondent, namely:

No. 9. From Amsterdam to London, Sunday, 28 Iyar תע"ד, 1714. Jehudah b. Isaac inquires whether R. Aaron has received the articles he has sent him by post and whether there was any profit on them. As in the former letter, he requests R. Aaron to report to him how his daughter, Blimche, is getting on and with whom she is now employed. He advises her again to husband her money and to have a care for the future. After all, she will not remain in domestic service all her life!

No. 3. Rotterdam to London, Monday, Rosh Chodesh Adar תע"ג, 1713. Jehudah b. Menachem, scribe and teacher of children in Rotterdam, who regularly buys skins (parchment) from R. Aaron in London, complains that in the last delivery one skin was faulty and had a hole—perhaps a total loss to the scribe. At the same time, he questions the price R. Aaron charges, as there is hardly any profit left for him. This being the case, he might just as well order the skins from Amsterdam and be better served and why bother "such an important and outstanding man" as R. Aaron. The price for a skin mentioned is one English shilling (דינר) on which R. Aaron is expected to make half a shilling profit. Only on such a basis, the correspondent suggests, could he envisage a small profit for himself and "see relief in his work." Apart from being a teacher, Jehudah is also engaged in writing Mezuzoth and Tefillin for R. Aaron, a work which is badly paid. The prices he quotes are most illuminating. While a Mezuzah was sold between $1\frac{1}{2}$ ב"ש (= stuivers = $7\frac{1}{2}$ Dutch cents) and 2 ב"ש (= 10 Dutch cents), the price of Tefillin was one guilder the pair, and with straps one guilder and 10 cents.

No. 4. Rotterdam to London, Friday, 26th Ab תע"ג 1713. This

letter was written by the same man some six months later. After a long, flowery introduction in which the writer expresses his deep respect and sentiments of great friendship for R. Aaron, he places a new order for skins. He asks him to have six skins specially prepared for the holy task of writing a Torah scroll. At the same time, he requests R. Aaron's co-operation in a match between his stepdaughter, the virgin Hendle (הענדלה) and Isaak (אייזק) son of the widow Sarah, wife of the late R. Itsik (רי איצק). He speaks in high terms of his stepdaughter, Hendle, who is a brave maiden, conspicuous for her good deeds and "particularly for her beauty, of which I have not seen the like in the whole of our congregation, and also well learned." He asks R. Aaron to take up the matter with the other party and to write to him fully "by the first post" about the position there, particularly with regard to the answer which he received and the dowry which he (Jehudah b. Menachem) is expected to provide. R. Aaron is asked to treat the matter confidentially for the time being. At the back of the letter there is added in Dutch:

"Dezen brief te bestellen aan Aron Moosis livth in Shoe makeroo near al gat at London."

* * *

The next three letters were written by Reichla, the daughter of R. Jehudah Leib (see above § 4, c). Two are addressed to R. Aaron and one to her daughter, Zedinah, and her husband, Abraham, in The Hague. The letters are dated only by the day of the week and the corresponding Sidra, but no year is mentioned and it is consequently difficult, judging by their contents alone, to decide which should be considered of an earlier or later date. It is possible that No. 5 was written prior to 1713, while No. 6 belongs to 1713 and No. 7 to 1714. The date of No. 6 is כסלו corresponding to the month of December, while שבט of letter No. 7 may correspond to the February of the following year.

It is characteristic of these letters and also of No. 8 that the greeting formula in Hebrew has been replaced by the more popular formula in Yiddish. The correspondents were simple, unlearned people who knew very little Hebrew and had to content themselves with the spoken vernacular. In those days letter-writing in Yiddish had already its well-established and accepted *formulae* of which our correspondents have made abundant use. As a rule, the letter starts

with the typical phrase, *פיל שלום איני לנג לעבין ואל דיר הש"י נעבין* etc. while R. Aaron is addressed as *מיין גוט נייר*, my well-wisher. There is also a moralising vein in some of the letters which betrays an unflinching belief in the righteousness of God and an unreserved acceptance of His will.

No. 5. Amsterdam to London, no date. The end of the letter carries a note: *יום נ"י פ' ויקהל*, without indication of the year. In it Reichla, daughter of Jehudah Leib, replies to a letter from R. Aaron in connection with a proposed match between her son, Mendle, and the daughter of a London man (whose name is not mentioned). She is annoyed with R. Aaron for his suggestion that she should sign a deed of promise for the amount of 50 pounds sterling as the dowry for her son against a mere 40 pounds from the other party. Why on earth should she give more? Only if the other party will commit themselves to a hundred pounds will she send the signed deed. After all, her son is not without means and is quite capable of earning a proper living; and he has no reason to be ashamed of his family either. In Amsterdam, he could easily get a dowry of 500 guilders, but, as he is already in London, let him marry there and save the cost of coming home. Ultimately she leaves the decision with Mendle. "Let him do what he likes. He knows the girl and she knows him."

No. 6 Amsterdam to The Hague, no date. At the back of the letter there is inserted: *יום ד' פ' מקץ* but there is no indication of the year. This letter, written by Reichla to her children, Zedinah, and her husband, Abraham, in The Hague (?), seems to be of a much later date than the former one. Mendle is already married and lives, together with his wife, in The Hague (?). In it she informs Zedinah that several days ago she had sent Mendle a letter through Shlome Shved's son, giving him full details about the cloth-remnants, which she could not get any more because they were already sold. She asks Zedinah to see to it that Mendle sends her the money she had borrowed for him. She is in a most difficult position as a result of being unable to return the money. She cannot look the people in the face. He is causing her a great deal of worry. She hoped to hear from him, but alas, he does not reply. Did Mendle not get her letter? In a footnote she adds: "With R. Aaron Sofer I shall send you a 'pintje' (a measure, about half a litre) of *לבאט* (?) and Kardamom (mustard?), together, as it is wholesome. I would have liked to send you a pintje anise, but he would not take it, so I will

send it on another occasion. Give my regards to Mendle and his wife."

* * *

It is rather doubtful whether this letter was in fact addressed to The Hague, where Zedinah and Mendle lived, and not to London. Would Reichla have taken so much care to send a parcel of tonics with R. Aaron of London to her children in The Hague?

No. 7. Amsterdam to London, no date. A note at the end of the letter states: **יום ו' פ' יתיר**, but gives no indication of the year. This letter could very well have been written soon after R. Aaron's visit to Amsterdam by the end of 1713 (**תע"ד** Kislev). If her former letter to Zedinah was written approximately in December, the present one of February could easily fit in into the picture. The letter deals with a claim for money. R. Aaron had received some books from Reichla but had failed so far to send her the money. Now she was in dire need of it as through the whole winter (at least the earlier part until February=Adar) she had been unable to earn anything. She was old and destitute and had to take to nursing sick people at night. She is full of bitter complaints. Nobody seemed to care for her any more, not even her children in London. They do not write at all and there is nobody to help her out in these difficult days. For this reason Reichla strongly appeals to R. Aaron to remember her old age and widowhood and to send her immediately the money which she requires so badly. The letter ends with the usual greetings to R. Aaron's wife and their children, and she particularly asks to be remembered to Mendle.

* * *

Is Mendle, who is mentioned here, her son? Surely by then he lived in London. In that case, we have here additional reason to believe that letter No. 6 was originally addressed to London.

No. 8. Amsterdam to London, date: Wednesday, 28th Tishri **תע"ד**=1713. Chronologically, this letter belongs to an earlier date than Nos. 6 and 7, written in all probability later in the year 1713. As we are, however, unable to establish the exact year of the former letters, I felt justified in treating the three letters by Reichla as one unit and in dealing with this one separately. This letter, the second in the collection, is not addressed to R. Aaron Sofer. It is a letter from Moses b. Meshullam in Amsterdam to his son **פ"מ**.

Feys in London. There is the usual complaint by the father, Moses, that he had not had any reply to his letter sent on a former occasion to Feys. He believes something must be wrong, or that Feys is annoyed with him for no reason whatsoever. He explains that as soon as he received Feys' order, he immediately purchased the slaughtering-knives and arranged with the servant, Michel, who stays with Alvares Dacosta to take them over to London. Unfortunately Michel disappointed him greatly by leaving for London without calling for the knives. He, the father, tried several other people but with no more success. Ultimately he had to resell the knives and lost three guilders on the deal. The second part of the letter contains some cheerful family news. Last Chol haMoed Sukkot, he reports, their daughter, Taub (טויב) became engaged to Leiser of Naarden. As the letter was written on the 28th Tishri, the happy event had taken place a week or so earlier. In a footnote, he is asked by Taub to send her a nice present. Finally Feys is asked by his father to acknowledge the consignment of herrings which he dispatched to him and his wife, Memele, from Amsterdam. Feys is addressed as "living with the old Rose Renis in the Beren Street" in London.

7. THE LANGUAGE

It is not my intention and certainly not the purpose of this article to deal in a more detailed manner with some of the intricate linguistic problems of the text. I would rather leave this task to the student of Yiddish philology. But a few more general remarks may be called for at this stage. In the correspondence, I submit, we have undoubtedly some striking examples of the former *Dutch Yiddish*, a branch of *Western Yiddish*. As H. Beem, in his interesting study on *Yiddish in Holland*, points out⁹: "the Holland dialect (of Yiddish) is a legitimate brother of Eastern Yiddish. It developed on the same general principles, but in another direction and under other influences . . . it did not undergo the influence of Slavic languages, but it was profoundly influenced by Dutch, precisely because as a fusion language it remained more hospitable to foreign influence." Many Dutch loanwords penetrated into the Yiddish of Holland.

London.

J. MAITLIS.

⁹ H. BEEM, "Yiddish in Holland: Linguistic and Socio-Linguistic Notes," in *The Field of Yiddish: Studies in Language, Folk-lore, and Literature*, Columbia University, New York, 1954.

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. RABBI COLON AND MESSER LEON

As an historical figure, Rabbi Joseph Colon (1420-1480) is best known for his controversy with his distinguished contemporary, Judah Messer Leon. The controversy roused widespread interest at the time and as it throws much light on the character of Colon and has been somewhat misrepresented by modern historians, it is worth while describing it in some detail.

Though a prolific writer and a leading figure in Italian Jewry in the fifteenth century, few biographical facts have come down to us about Judah ben Jehiel Rofeh, better known as Judah Messer Leon. In this respect he shares the fate of his antagonist, Joseph Colon. We know neither the date of his birth nor of his death.¹ He started his rabbinical career in Ancona,² and lived for some time in Venice.³ From his son, David Messer Leon, we gather that in 1471 he was already in Mantua,⁴ and the Mantuan Archives record that he was still residing there on March 13, 1475.⁵ It was there that his work *Nofeth Šufim*—the first Hebrew book to be published during the lifetime of its author—was printed by Conat between 1476 and 1480.⁶

From the Medieval Chronicle, *Shalshet ha-Kabbalah*⁷ written by Gedaliah b. Joseph Ibn Yahya, we learn that while Colon and Messer Leon were both residing in Mantua, a feud broke out between them in which the entire community of Mantua took part. The strife at last became so bitter, that the Duke Lodovico Gonzaga II banished both protagonists from the city to restore order.⁸

In view of the fact that Colon was still residing in Mantua on April 26, 1475,⁹ and Messer Leon's book was not published there before 1476, the controversy can thus be dated as 1476-1477.¹⁰

Our authorities give no indication as to the subject of the con-

¹ I. HUSIK, *Judah Messer Leon's Commentary on the "Vetus Logica,"* (Leyden 1906) p. 5.

² H. ROSENBERG, *Cenni biografici di alcuni Rabbini e Letterati della Comunità Israelitica di Ancona* (Casale Monferrato 1932), p. 16.

³ U. CASSUTO in *Encyclopædia Judaica* (Berlin 1928-1934), Vol. VIII, Col. 999.

⁴ *Kevod Hakhamim*, ed. S. BERNFELD, (Berlin 1899), p. 19.

⁵ V. COLONI, "Note per la biografia di alcuni dotti ebrei vissuti a Mantova nel secolo XV," in *Annuario Di Studi Ebraici* (Rome 1935) Vol. I, p. 173.

⁶ Z. FRANKEL in *Literaturblatt des Orients* (Leipzig 1848) p. 382.

⁷ Ed. Amsterdam 1697, p. 48B.

⁸ *Qore ha-Dorot*, ed. D. CASSEL (Berlin 1846), p. 51.

⁹ V. COLONI, *op. cit.* pp. 169-183.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

trovery, which remains a matter for conjecture. From Colon's *Responsa* it is evident that he and Messer Leon were at one time on excellent terms. Messer Leon was one of Colon's correspondents and is addressed by him in a manner indicating high esteem.¹¹ To judge from the tone of one *Responsum*, dealing with the permissibility of a Jew wearing the academic dress, known as the *Cappa*,¹² they would seem to have been intimate friends. There can be no question, however, that they differed on the question of the value attached to secular studies, and that Messer Leon's attitude in this matter was far more liberal than that of Colon. Graetz¹³ sees in this diversion of views the root of the quarrel, which he regards as the conflict of Talmudist versus Humanist. "However well they might agree for a time," he writes, "Joseph Colon, the strict Talmudist, and Messer Leon, the cultured man of letters, could not long tolerate each other." Weiss¹⁴ and Güdemann¹⁵ adopt the view taken by Graetz, that their quarrel was inevitable, "since Joseph Colon represented the narrow dogmatism and pious zeal of the French Rabbis, whereas Messer Leon stood for the culture and the free spirit of inquiry that flourished in Italy."

Superficially this view has much to commend it, but it will not bear close examination. Messer Leon's humanism did not in the least affect his devotion to the Torah. His chief work, *Nofeth Sufim* (the drippings of the honeycomb), contains nothing that could arouse the antagonism or even the criticism of a Talmudist.

In this book, which is an attempt to "apply to Scripture the rules and terminology of classical rhetoric, as found in the writings of Cicero and Quintillian," Messer Leon affirms repeatedly his implicit faith in the "Holy Torah."¹⁶ "In our Book of Books, the 'Holy Torah,'" he says, "all wisdom and understanding is to be found." "The Law of God is perfect. It is, indeed, the emblem of perfection. It is wholly sufficient by itself." "The wisdom of the Torah is to that of other nations as the hyssop of the walls is to the cedars of Lebanon."¹⁷ Nor does Messer Leon confine himself

11 COLON, *Responsa*, (Venice 1519), No. 8.

12 *Ibid.*

13 *Geschichte der Juden* (Leipzig 1890), Vol. VIII, p. 243.

14 *Dor Dor Vedorshav* (Berlin 1923), Vol. 5, p. 280.

15 A. S. FRIEDBERG, *ha-Torah V'hachaim*, Hebrew trans. of M. GÜDEMANN'S *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der abendländischen Juden während des Mittelalters*. (Warsaw 1899), Vol. III, p. 186.

16 Ed. A. JELLINECK (Vienna 1863) p. 47.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 48.

to mere generalisations; he devotes whole passages in his book to reasons for the observance of the Sabbath, the eating of Matzoth, and the wearing of phylacteries.¹⁸ Unlike Maimonides, who, in his *Guide* holds that the "Tabernacle" in the wilderness was meant simply to serve as deterrent from the practice of idolatry, Messer Leon regards the Tent of Meeting and its utensils as "reminders of the Divine." There was, in fact, nothing in his book to which Colon could have objected. He merely extols rhetoric, a subject which Colon could not view with hostility, since he himself paid great attention to style, and even quotes Kimchi's grammatical works. Had Colon objected to humanistic studies and their exponents, he would not have befriended and corresponded with Elijah Cretensis ben Moses Abba Delmedigo (1460-1497) and Samuel Modena.

If the *Nofeth Şufim* itself was innocuous, other sources make it even less likely that Colon would have found fault with Messer Leon on religious grounds. The manuscript at Parma, a commentary called "עין הקורא" by David Messer Leon, son of Judah, shows that the latter was guilty of that same "narrow dogmatism" and "pious zeal" of which Colon is accused. David informs us that Messer Leon forbade under penalty of excommunication the reading of the commentary of Levi ben Gerson (1288-1331), "because it contained heresies." "Despite his mastery of philosophy and depth of understanding, he would roar like a lion to crush heresy out of the land." "He was," says David, "zealous for the law of God."

It is a fact that among the Jews the widespread pursuit of philosophic studies and general culture was not detrimental to Jewish traditional life. In the Christian world, it is true, the power and spiritual universality of the Papacy were seriously challenged. But as far as Jewry was concerned, the Renaissance was not an age of conflict between traditional beliefs and advanced ideas. In contrast with the Haskalah movement at the end of the eighteenth century, culture in Italy never became synonymous with heresy. Many prominent men of the time united piety with philosophic study. As in the Spanish "Golden period," Rabbis sought the acquisition of secular knowledge and some, like Judah

¹⁸ Ed. A. JELLINECK (Vienna, 1863), p. 46.

¹⁹ P. PERREAU, "Hebräische Handschriften in Parma" in *Hebräische Bibliographie*, ed. M. STEINSCHNEIDER (Berlin 1864), Vol. VII, p. 64.

Messer Leon and Elijah Delmedigo, to name two outstanding examples of Italian Jewish enlightenment, combined a thorough knowledge of the Talmud with a mastery of several contemporary sciences.

Johanan Alamanno, Elias Levita (1469-1539), and Samuel Modena were anything but unbelievers. They were convinced that the religious truth of Judaism had nothing to fear from reasoned speculation. If Italy was the home of the Jews who had been indoctrinated with the spirit of free inquiry, it also produced great centres where Talmudic learning was in the ascendant and where Jewish life and scholarship flourished.

In regarding the controversy between Colon and Messer Leon as a struggle between Talmudism and Humanism, Graetz seems to have made the same error as Isaac Weiss, who ascribed a similar cause to the controversy between Judah Minz and Elijah Delmedigo. Just as, if we turn to the *Responsa* of Mizrahi, we find²⁰ that the latter conflict revolved round an halakic matter, so also in this case, we can find a complete explanation in the temper and character of Messer Leon as amply revealed to us in his Epistles. In one of these, written in 1474, against an opponent,²¹ he claims merit for his own industry and talents and is full of self-praise. "Have not the Gentile sages," he writes, "seeing the honour paid to me, exclaimed: 'there is no man wiser or of greater understanding than myself?'" He also betrays an unseemly pride in his literary attainments. "I was appointed lecturer to Gentile Assemblies. I have been fighting the battles of the Lord. I am full of knowledge and understanding, who is there like unto me?" He tabulates his achievements with much self-adulation. "Twenty years ago, I composed a grammatical work which is sweeter than honey to them that taste it . . . and who excelled me in Rhetoric . . . my hand was stretched out to strangers."²²

He further betrays a lack of self-restraint in dealing with those who offended him. "I hate him, he is a base fellow . . . he dared to accuse me of lacking wisdom and understanding, my fury is kindled against him. . . . Happy is the man who will humiliate him with shame and reproach."²³

²⁰ E. MIZRAHI, *Responsa*, ed. M. RABINOWICZ (Jerusalem 1938) No. 56.

²¹ P. PERREAU in *Jeschurun*, "Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums," ed. by JOSEPH KOBAC (Breslau 1871), Vol. VII, p. 27.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 32, 26 and 31.

Although we do not know the inner history of the struggle that led to the expulsion from Mantua of these two great scholars and one-time friends, one thing may be confidently assumed: the issues involved were due more to a difference in temperament than to conflicting religious opinions. This was no battle between science and religion, but rather a clash of two forceful personalities. Both were headstrong and dogmatic, and neither of them of a conciliatory disposition.

London.

H. RABINOWICZ.

2. EUSEBES LOGISMOS IN IV MACC.

This expression would seem to occur only in *IV Macc.* There is, however, a similar phrase in Philo, *quis rer, div. her.* 201 (*hosioi logismoï* opposed to *anosioi logismoï*). Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale 8, Paris 1925, p. 29, is certainly right in pointing out similarities in thought between Philo and *IV Macc.*; but in Philo there is no further instance of such a paradoxical epithet to *logismos*. It should be mentioned that the cod. Sinaiticus omitted *eusebes* in the second case of its occurrence jointly with *logismos* (I 7), and cod. Venetus omitted it in the first sentence too. The two copyists seem to have felt hurt by this oxymoron.

There are several parallel and synonymous expressions. For the most important see Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments*, Vol. II, Leipzig 1857, p. 297. They mostly link *logismos* with either piety or philosophy.

A definition of *logismos* using the terms *orthos logos* and *sophia* is given by the author I 15 (where the reading of Sinaiticus is to be accepted). For *orthos logos* cf. Grimm, *loc. cit.*, and Pauly-Wissowa's *RE* s.v. *Logos*, Col. 1058f. Compare also *IV Macc.* vi 7 with Philo, *de Abr.* 170. The definition of *sophia* as given in *IV Macc.* i, 16, 17 is almost identical with that in Plut., *Plac. Phil.* I 1. For *gnosis* instead of *episteme* cf. Ptolemäios *Peri Kriterion*, ed. Hanow, p. 8, line 17f. and Lammert in *Hermes* lvii (1922) 185. For *nous* and *episteme* see also Grimm, *l.c.* *Nomos* here as in the other passages of *IV Macc.* obviously means the divine Law. An examination of the *nomos* passages in the *LXX* (based on Hatch and Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*) suggests that in most

cases *nomos* meaning divine Law has the article, except in special cases (as e.g., *theios nomos*). In *IV Macc.* *nomos* occurs 41 times, twice in the vocative. Of the remaining 39 instances only five have no article, four of them according to the above-mentioned rule. *Nomos* appears also in connection with *logismos*, e.g., V 34, 35, a particularly striking passage. For *logismos* instead of *logos* see Townshend's introduction to his translation of *IV Macc.* in Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. II. See also *IV Macc.* v 36 and vii 9, 15, where the life of Eleazar, the representative of *eusebes logismos* par excellence, is called "life faithful to the Law." The relation between *nomos* and *sophia* becomes clear vii 7.

Finally, explicit references to the connection of *eusebeia* and *logismos* are to be found in three passages: vii 1 (*logismos* as a servant—and an indispensable one for that matter—of *eusebeia*), vii 21 ss. (21: philosophy and piety almost synonymous; 22: piety as the aim of virtuous activity) and xiv 6 (piety as prompting virtuous activity, i.e., an activity congruous with the instructions of piety).

Thus, the paradox of *eusebes logismos* would seem to mean: "Reasoning which follows the rules of piety (these rules being known to us from the divine Law)" and, at the same time, "reasoning for the sake of piety."

Townshend's translation (*op. cit.*) "inspired reason" as well as the Syriac version (*The Fourth book of Maccabees in Syriac and Kindred Texts*, edited by Bensly, Cambridge 1895) "true thought congruous with the fear of God" agree with the first part of our interpretation. Our inquiry confirms the bare statement offered by I. Heinemann in Pauly-Wissowa's *RE* s.v. IV Makkabæerbuch and in Jul. Guttman, *Die Philosophie des Judentums*, Munich, 1933, p. 32.

S. LAUER.

Manchester.

CURRENT LITERATURE

RECENT LITERATURE ON PSYCHOLOGY AND THE STUDY OF RELIGIONS

A number of books have collected on the reviewer's desk, some more, some less directly concerned with Jewish studies, but all characterised by a psychological, i.e., profounder, interpretative approach to religion. The adjective "psychological" may not be quite correct in the case of Professor Eliade's work, but his own phenomenological approach parallels that of the psychologist in so many respects that the inclusion of his recent publication in this survey may well seem justified.

Any publication by this great master of the comparative study of religions must arouse great expectations; it would be too much to ask that they should always be fulfilled. Professor Eliade devotes his book on the *Myth of the Eternal Return*¹ to a study of certain aspects of primitive "ontology," or, in other words, of certain fundamental notions about the nature of the world as conceived by archaic mentality and as organised in a specific attitude or spirituality. These are, of course, expressed in rituals and myths which must provide us with the clues to their implicit "philosophy." With his customary mastery of the subject, M. Eliade marshals a vast amount of the most diverse historical and ethnological data and concludes that the archaic time-pattern of primitive man entails a depreciation of concrete, historical time. This is interpreted as an attempt to render the terrors and sufferings of history innocuous by disregarding their real, historic character. Contrasted with this cyclical pattern (represented by Greek thought, Buddhism, Brahmanism and such moderns as Nietzsche), there is the linear, progressive pattern inspired by the Bible. Time and history also play an important rôle in the philosophies of Hegel and his successors, and in modern existentialism. With human history heading towards crisis, the problem of the "historical man" has acquired new urgency.

Now much of all this is more or less commonplace in recent literature, though it should be added that the original French

¹ MIRCEA ELIADE, *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, transl. from the French by Willard R. Trask, 1955, pp. xi + 195 (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 18s.).

edition of this book was published in 1949. Professor Eliade does not refer with one word to the extensive and detailed studies of the problem in its classical, biblical, and philosophical aspects in recent theological work, particularly since the publication of O. Cullmann's *Christus u. die Zeit*. M. Eliade's important contribution lies in his analysis of the primitive or "archaic" religions, and it is regrettable that he could not resist the temptation of discussing also Hegel and other philosophers. One is, at least, glad to know that the author decided to suppress the subtitle "Introduction to a philosophy of history," for the references to philosophical problems are either so vague or so superficial that they seem to detract from the value of an otherwise valuable book. More particularly the reader cannot help feeling that a profounder study should have been made of some of the books mentioned in the bibliography, e.g., of K. Loewith's excellent *Meaning in History*.

In other respects too the book does not escape the inevitable pitfalls of all comparative study. Since no one can hope to acquire sufficient first-hand knowledge of all the languages and literatures concerned, much information is simply copied. This does not always seriously affect the argument, though it may occasionally jar on the reader's ears (e.g., p. 16 "the *Yoma*"). It is more serious when highly dubious hypotheses like that of a New Year festival with ritual combat and all in the temple of Jerusalem are simply taken for granted. The same applies to the Babylonian *akitu*; a careful examination of the textual evidence (particularly of *VAT 9555*) hardly allows the constructions placed upon it since Zimmern's translation in 1918. (Cf. Professor van Soden's recent article in *ZA* [N.F. xvii] 1955). It is doubtful whether Josephus gives us the traditional Israelite symbolism of the Jerusalem Temple (p. 77). The account of the biblical notion of history (p. 102f.) and its relation to nature suffers by not paying sufficient attention to the concept of *berit*. In fact, even the cyclical continuity of natural time is guaranteed by a covenant (cf. *Gen.* 8: 20-22; *Jer.* 31: 34-5, 33: 20-21, 25-26) that is in social and "historical" categories. Occasionally doubtful generalisations are made about the prophetic methods of "tolerating" history, and the prophetic attitude is not sufficiently distinguished from later apocalyptic. The reference to Ezekiel (p. 8) is irrelevant and meaningless.

But all these are minor points. Of greater import is the author's main thesis. Now it is true that the repetitive pattern of archetypal

acts, perpetuating something exemplarily done and established *in illo tempore* is characteristic of "archaic" mentality. In fact, the same notion was expressed even better by Jane Harrison when she described every ritual act as something "pre-done" and "re-done," *i.e.*, conforming to an eternal pattern and thus never unique. If this is so, greater stress should be laid on the permanence of the transpersonal patterns, structures or archetypes; the act *in illo tempore* may be no more than a secondary reduction. (This point has been made a.o. by T. H. Gaster). Moreover, Professor Eliade has adduced no evidence whatsoever in support of his interpretation that the archaic mentality tries to evade the "terror of history," whereas the linear pattern bravely faces it. It seems much more probable that the linear conception is a pathetic attempt to mitigate these terrors by seeing in them meaningful happenings (or acts of God), designed to lead us to a destined goal. The cyclical pattern cannot provide meaning; it is heroic to the point of nihilism. Not without reason has the irruption of linear, Biblical time into the "vicious" circle of pagan time been experienced as a salvation. For the salvation that is called history did, in fact, come of the Jews. For a phenomenologist it is safer to say that certain cultures do not know history in the directed, linear sense, rather than to assert that they want to abolish it. For the implied assumption that history does exist in any meaningful, objective sense is phenomenologically inadmissible and philosophically doubtful.

It comes as a surprise that in spite of Professor Eliade's frequent use of the term "archetype," he has not seen fit to mention the name of Jung, who, more than anyone else, is responsible for this term being a household-word in modern study. This is not to minimise the differences in the meaning attached to this protean word by Eliade and Jung: for the former it has an ontological reference which is absent from the more psychological usage of the latter. Nevertheless, considering the influence and range of Jungian studies on religion and, more particularly, the surprising correspondence of Jung's archetypes to the structures of the religious consciousness, one would expect a study like this to mention at least (a) the existence of Jung and his researches, (b) the exact nature of the differences in attitude and in the use of "archetype," and (c) a reasoned justification of the further rejection of Jungian insights and categories. This serious charge was already levelled at Professor Eliade's *Traité d'histoire des religions* (1943) and its

glaring silence on the subject by Fokke Sierksma in his important study *Phänomenologie der Religion und Komplexpsychologie* (1951); it is provoked again by the present book. In recent years Professor Eliade has been drawn into the orbit of the Eranos-circle where he has become a regular speaker.

Reference has just been made to the Eranos-circle. Perhaps it should be explained that for more than 20 years scholars of the most diverse preoccupations and background are meeting every summer at Ascona for an *eranos*. As at the *eranos*-gatherings of old, every participant brings his own fare; the result is laid down in more than 20 impressive volumes of *Eranos-Jahrbücher* (1933f.). The unity in this diversity is achieved not only by a central theme for each year (ideas of Redemption, *Magna Mater*, Mysteries, Gnosis, Man, Spirit, Ritual, Time, etc.) but by the common concern of all taking part: philologists, theologians, psychologists, biologists, mathematicians, and others. The common concern is the understanding in terms of permanent relevance of the basic principles and expressions of human existence and mentation. For the Eranos-circle this means primarily the symbols, ideas, mythological images, rites, concepts, and structures of reality as conceived and presented by religions, mysticism, art, and the sciences. Eranos is, as it were, a gigantic symposium on *Symbolism*. A full review of Eranos is impossible in these pages. Suffice it to say that here "comparative religion" is studied in an exemplary fashion and that the student of Jewish religion too will find much of supreme interest in the regular contributions of Professor Scholem since 1949 (Kabbalah and Myth, Kabbalistic Ritual, The Shekinah, The Golem, etc.).

The first volume² to appear in English collects a number of essays drawn from various *Jahrbücher*. None of the essays on the theme of *Spirit and Nature* has any direct bearing on Jewish studies, with the possible exception of Max Pulver's article on "Philo's use of *pneuma*."

Dr. Schär's work,³ too, is of more general interest. "Vertical" studies, describing the development of religious ideas are legion. "Horizontal" studies, aiming at a thorough understanding of a particular religious phenomenon in all its forms and expressions, are extremely rare. Apart from Heiler's monumental work on

² *Spirit and Nature*: Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks, ed. by J. CAMPBELL, Vol. I, 1955. Pp. xvi + 492 (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 35s.).

³ HANS SCHAR: *Erlösungsvorstellungen und ihre psychologischen Aspekte*, 1950. Pp. 702. (Rascher Verlag, Sw. Fr. 39.50.)

Prayer, almost nothing has been done in this branch of study and one should be grateful to the Rev. H. Schär for attempting a comprehensive survey of the ideas and experiences connected with salvation and redemption. In one important respect his set-up is different from Heiler's. Heiler was mainly concerned with the objective phenomenon, and he examined all the available material in order to arrive at a typology of kinds of prayer, their patterns and functions, and their relation to the larger religious contexts in which they have their place. Dr. Schär's work is primarily psychological; the object of his analysis is the character and meaning of the human experiences that are or could be described with the words "I am saved." In Jungian psychology Dr. Schär possesses a flexible and really "catholic" instrument, and his typological framework is most illuminating. He is careful to point out that not every experience of salvation is necessarily religious and that religion may have other functions or results than "salvation." After a preliminary discussion of the phenomenology of salvation, the author distinguishes between salvation (1) as the experience of belonging to a community, (2) as re-direction of psychic energy (*libido*), (3) as a new ordering of the soul (*confessio*), (4) by the "wholly other" or (5) by finding a rigid, protective system or "shell" (*Gehäuse* in the terminology of Karl Jaspers), (6) by conversion, (7) by a narrowing of the personality or (8) by an enlargement of the personality, and (9) as the way of psychic integration or individuation.

Christian, Gnostic, and other forms of salvation are easily fitted into this scheme. Unfortunately the exposition in detail is often disappointing. This may partly be due to the fact that Dr. Schär concentrates rather on the Christian world and more particularly on its modern phase. As a result his study gains in immediate, pastoral interest what it loses for the historian of religions. Eastern religions are treated rather more summarily, no doubt owing to the author's lack of first-hand knowledge. This is, in fact, apparent throughout the book; e.g., all quotations from mystical writers are derived from Evelyn Underhill. And who, one would like to know, is the Ben Akiba [!] who said "there is nothing new under the sun" [sic!] (pp. 540-1). The reader must often feel that he is given either too much or too little and the whole book often seems more like a sound, commonsensical and extremely stimulating pastoral *causerie* than a strictly academic

study of the subject. But in spite of these criticisms, and in spite of some doubtful psychological interpretations, Dr. Schär's study remains a valuable contribution for which one cannot but be grateful.

Neumann's *magnum opus*⁴ may well be called a historical phenomenology of religion. It is an attempt to outline the development of archetypes which, in their turn, are shown to correspond to the phenomenological structures of the religious consciousness. Much that is implicit in the writings of C. G. Jung (who contributes a Foreword) is, for the first time, fully worked out. Particularly Jung's hints concerning the "biological" foundations of the psyche are developed further, often with illuminating results (cf. the author's stress on the secondary character of sexual differentiation, the analogy of metabolic rhythms, the objective reality of transpersonal functions, innate mechanisms of "entelechy" etc.), though, it must be admitted, there is no dearth of disconcerting and dubious assertions (e.g., the rather naïve acceptance of antiquated concepts like phylogenesis). The emphasis is on the multiple reference and function of symbols—their "multivalence"—and the author can thus distinguish layers of meaning (e.g., personal and transpersonal) in such symbols as incest, castration, etc. A particularly happy idea is the application of the archeological term Sequence Dating to a comprehensive mythological stratification. The archeologist's S.D. does not fix absolute, chronological dates. Similarly, the *ouroboros* comes *before* the Great Mother, who is followed by the Dragon Fight, etc., without implying anything as to historical chronologies. Dr. Neumann's amazingly vast knowledge of mythologies provides an inexhaustible store of comparative material. The fact that most of his knowledge is perforce second-hand and that the vastness of the material simply invites imprecisions, faulty generalisations, and misinterpretations, obviously disturbs the specialist reader more than it did the author. But the predicament is not Dr. Neumann's alone; it is that of Comparative Religion or Mythology as a scientific discipline. Yet in spite of its obvious shortcomings and (from an academic point of view) its undisciplined or even reckless character, no one seriously interested in a proper understanding of religions and mythologies can afford to ignore this

4 E. NEUMANN: *The Origins and History of Consciousness*, 1955. (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 30s.)

book. The admirable translation by R. F. C. Hull greatly mitigates the Teutonic turgidity of the author's original.

Apart from these rather general works, there are a number of psychological studies of specific problems. Amongst them is a volume by C. G. Jung⁵ which can fairly be described as a collection of studies on the phenomenology of the Spirit, provided the term Spirit is taken in a psychological and not in a metaphysical sense. There is no doubt that the experience of the Spirit is a psychological phenomenon to whose elucidation the psychologist may have something to contribute. If, in this context, he describes the Spirit as an "archetype," this too is perfectly legitimate. It is outside the purview of this Journal to review at length C. G. Jung's chapters on various manifestations of this archetype (*e.g.*, in Fairy Tales, as the spirit Mercury in Fairy Tales and Alchemy, in the theological dogma of the Trinity, etc.). Dr. Schärf's contribution, however, should be of the greatest interest and there is little doubt that any fair and open-minded reader will find her essay to be an exciting and almost breath-taking experience. Psychological understanding and categories are employed in a thorough and painstaking analysis of the meaning and function of *Satan* (the figure and the word) in the various Biblical passages where he (or it) occurs. The result is a major contribution to the theology of the Old Testament, since it is not Satan but the concept of God himself on which ultimately light is thrown. Miss Schärf conducts her inquiry with philological precision and with all the paraphernalia of academic scholarship that usually surround doctoral dissertations. She discusses the meaning of *satan* in "secular" and "metaphysical" contexts; the terms *mal'akh YHVH* and *beney ha'-elohim* and their relation to Satan (in *Nu.* 22 and *Job* respectively); the Satan as opponent of the *mal'akh YHVH* in *Zc.* 3: 1f. and finally as an independent "demonic" power 1 *Chr.* 21: 1. There emerges a clear line of evolution of the image of *YHVH*: It develops from that of an ethically neutral, undifferentiated spirit-numen, via a more highly differentiated, ethical personality-structure, to a final dissociation of the good and evil, *viz.*, light and dark (satanic) aspects.

The main objection to Miss Schärf's presentation is, perhaps, her

⁵ C. G. JUNG: *Symbolik des Geistes*, with a contribution by Riwkah Schärf: *Die Gestalt des Satan im Alten Testament*, 1948. Pp. xii + 500. (Rascher Verlag, Zurich.)

dating of the texts and their correlation to her scheme of progressive psychological development. It looks too much like the nineteenth century evolutionary schemes in which the present generation seems to have lost faith: chronological and phenomenological sequences do not always dovetail. Greater acquaintance with the work of English scholars, particularly Wheeler Robinson, would probably have resulted in a slightly different placing of emphases. The central thesis of Satan as part of the total divine personality is, of course, not a new discovery. But Dr. Schärf is the first to make a serious attempt to work it out carefully, to marshal all the relevant material and, above all, to interpret it in a dimension of depth. No wonder that there is a profoundly religious quality about her psychological essay that compares favourably with what usually passes as theological writing.

The C. G. Jung Institute of Psychology publishes from time to time studies and monographs on various subjects connected with psychology. Volume III⁶ contains three essays. The first, by H. Jacobsohn, on the so called *Dialogue of a Misanthrope with his own Soul* should be of interest also to Egyptologists who may welcome a new attempt at interpreting this intriguing text, even if they will not always be able to accept the author's psychological perspectives. Dr. Marie-Louise von Franz interprets *The Dream of Descartes* according to the method already applied by her to the *Passio Perpetuae*. Readers of this Journal will mainly be interested in Dr. S. Hurwitz's paper on *Archetypische Motive in der Chassidischen Mystik* (pp. 123-212). The article takes up a suggestion by Scholem (in the Bergmann-Festschrift *הנרות*, 1944) to identify the term *kadmut ha-sekkel* occurring in the writings of the Great Maggid of Mezritch, with the psychological concept of the Unconscious. Scholem, who already referred to a similar interpretation by A. Marcus, collected the passages where the term occurs and examined its meaning also in relation to similar ideas in the writings of R. Shneur Zalman of Ladi. Hurwitz bases himself completely on Scholem, but tries to interpret the material in the perspective of Jungian psychology. As his exposition is addressed to laymen in matters kabbalistic, he has to digress continually to explain kabbalistic terms and concepts occurring in the text. Now

⁶ *Zeitlose Dokumente der Seele* (Studien aus dem C. G. Jung Institut. Zurich, Vol. III), 1952. Pp. 212 (Rascher Verlag, Sw. Frs. 17.70.)

it is well known that hassidic writers constantly use traditional kabbalistic terminology without necessarily meaning it, that is without necessarily accepting or implying the theories originally connected with these terms (cf. the function of the *sephiroth* in classical Kabbalah and Hassidism respectively). However, the terms do occur and as a result Dr. Hurwitz's exposition develops from a commentary on the Maggidic passages collected by Scholem to a ramble over the whole field of kabbalistic doctrine. *Sephiroth*, *En-Soph*, letter-, Tetragrammaton-, and *conjunctio*-mysticism are discussed so that the essay, though not contributing very much to the study of hassidic doctrine, will serve as an excellent introduction to kabbalistic symbolism with a psychological bias.

The insufficiency in the treatment of the hassidic doctrines is due to the absence of a thorough study of the whole corpus of Maggidic teaching. Everybody knows that the "objectified" theosophy of the kabbalists is subjectified or introverted in Hassidism and becomes a kind of psychology. But the extent to which this happens, the points at which it takes place and its relation to the general ontology of the hasidic teachers still require a thorough investigation of the whole relevant literature. A study based on the analysis of a few selected quotations must of necessity miss the main problem: the exact nature of the Maggid's teaching and its relation to that of his disciple, the *Tanya*. Still, Dr. Hurwitz is doing pioneer work in a field that simply cries out for psychological methods.

Both Dr. Schärf and Dr. Hurwitz have contributed to the *Festschrift* in honour of C. G. Jung's eightieth birthday.⁷ Vol. I of this *Festschrift* is devoted to theoretical and casuistic contributions to analytical psychology, that is to the special and often highly esoteric type of psychology practised by Jungians. The second volume brings studies on various themes connected with the history of civilisation and religion. It is almost needless to say that a large number of these are written in the psychological jargon and with the woolliness of thought, lack of scientific discipline and weakness for arrogant and illegitimate generalisations that seem to have become the hall-mark of much Jungian literature. Fortunately there are always a few righteous to save the city.

⁷ *Studien zur Analytischen Psychologie C. G. Jung's* (Jung-Festschrift), 1955. (Rascher Verlag, Zurich. Vol. I, pp. 396. Sw. Frs. 22.90; Vol. II, pp 397, Sw. Frs. 22.90.)

Two essays in Vol. II are relevant to Jewish studies. Riwkah Schärf writes beautifully on "Saul und der Geist Gottes," and readers of her study on Satan will quickly recognise the persistence of the same motifs. In a careful and sensitive analysis of the text she succeeds in bringing out the profound differences between Saul and David and their respective way to kingship. David accepts kingship simply, unproblematically, "amidst his brethren"; Saul exhibits a reluctant fear that augurs ill for his future (1 *Sam.* 9: 21, 10: 22). The anointing results in an immediate *charisma* for David, the Spirit of God coming upon him "from that day forward"; Saul is merely told to expect a "change of heart." When it happens it takes the form of the "prophetic" *charisma* of violent possession by the *ruah*. (*ibid.* 10: 9f.; cf. also 11: 6). It is easy to see how this possession could assume a negative character in due course (*ibid.* 16: 4). Miss Schärf believes that a study of the phenomenon "Saul" reveals the tension and conflict inherent in the biblical idea of kingship, caught, as it were, between the horns of the royal v. prophetic dilemma. Saul is ultimately a victim of divine experimentation; he is broken by his insufficiency with regard to the divine demand which itself somehow reflects a need or tension within the divine itself. There is a psychological dimension to God's words "It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king" (*ibid.* 15: 11).

S. Hurwitz presents a well-written and very readable account of *Sabbatai Zwi* (pp. 239-63). Again his study bases itself on Professor Scholem's researches, but goes beyond Scholem in attempting a psychological interpretation. This raises a fundamental, methodological problem: how much and what exactly can we expect from psychology in such cases? Professor Scholem himself has gone with some detail into the matter of Sabbatai's "strange" behaviour and his manic-depressive states. This investigation was not inspired by the sheer pleasure in a clinical diagnosis, but by the recognition that Sabbatai's psychology has a direct bearing on the historical development of Sabbatian theology. Hurwitz, too, knows that clinical diagnoses do not bring us anywhere near the heart of the problem; but one may, perhaps, wonder whether any better purpose is served by calling in categories like "split anima," archetype, etc. His assertion that the messianic expectations of that age should be understood as "the constellation of the archetype of wholeness" (or integration), seems to overlook the fact that

every age has had its messianic movements—albeit less explosive—and that the individual demand for psychic integration should therefore apply not only to Sabbatai but to all pseudo-Messiahs. In fact, why not to every single individual? The interpretation of messiah-hood in terms of the individuation archetype ought to imply the “messiah-hood of all believers.” Unless it is maintained and proved that this demand in fact only directed itself to the pseudo-messianic figures, it can hardly be used to explain the rise and fate of messianic pretenders. If Sabbatai really erred in projecting the messianic calling instead of understanding it as an individual, inner development, then this failure can hardly be laid at his door. It would be the failure of the Jewish tradition to effect this “interiorisation” since it insisted on the external, historical character of messianism. There is no reason to assume that Sabbatai alone was called to transcend the traditional “projection” and to realise the true meaning of the messianic myth as a symbol of the inner man. All things considered, Joseph Kastein’s interpretation in his biography *Sabbatai Zwi* seems more satisfactory.

R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY.

Manchester.

S. SCHONFELD. *The Universal Bible, being the Pentateuchal Texts at first addressed to all Nations (Torat B'nei No'ach)*. Translation and Notes by S. Schonfeld, 1955. 186 pp. Sidgwick & Jackson, 15s.

Rabbi Schonfeld’s starting point is the very sound observation that the Bible has a universal relevance; at least it has come to be meaningful to men and women all over the world. On the other hand it has been observed with equal soundness that the Bible is clearly addressed to and concerned with a particular group. Confusion arises if the whole of Scripture is considered to be of equal authority, or of equal application to groups for whom it was not, primarily, intended. Rabbi Schonfeld undertakes to isolate the “universal” teaching of Scripture but limits his attempt to the Pentateuch. It is easy to predict that the major part

of the Universal Bible will consist of Genesis. However, the revelation on Mt. Sinai is “universal” too, mainly, one supposes, because it went forth in “seventy languages.”

Rabbi Schonfeld thus squarely stands on theological ground and no one would think of denying his right to do so. There are, however, two types of biblical theology: one that accepts the findings of scholarship in historical and philological matters, and one which believes that it can or must ignore them. Rabbi Schonfeld’s theology is of the latter kind. There is, in addition, a literary problem. It is one thing to assume a universal relevance of the Bible in terms of a “catholic” human message emerging from its total context; it is quite a different matter to distinguish between universal and national paragraphs in one chapter. Particularly if one holds the Pentateuchal narratives to be a literary

or compositional unity, then the procedure of extracting universal bits becomes extremely dubious.

The translation is often surprising, to say the least. **אֶרֶץ** is sometimes "earth" and sometimes "world"; God breathed into man's "visage the movement of life"; and Gen. xii, 3, is translated "yet all the races of the earth shall be blessed through you" [!]. Frequent reference is made to the "Biblical Tradition" by which, of course, Rabbinic tradition is meant. The notes discuss special subjects such as creation, vegetarianism, the soul, education, marriage and heredity, etc. They abound in striking, provocative, pugnacious, amusing, and very often wrong-headed statements which sufficiently attest the essentially homiletic character of the publication. Z.W.

To Do and To Teach: Essays in Honour of Charles Lynn Pyatt. 1953. Pp. viii + 186. (College of the Bible, Lexington. \$5.00).

Only the first five of about 20 articles contained in this volume bear on the Old Testament. Discussing the "Nearness of God and Psalm lxxiii," Sheldon H. Blank makes a number of sound observations. His main point, however, is the emendation of Ps. lxxiii, 24 **ואחריך** to **ואחר כבוד תקחני** **תדבקני** "keeping me near," thus eliminating the awkward reference to afterlife. However, the use of **Hi. בָּק** is doubtful in this sense in spite of Jer. xiii, 11, and the possible connotation of **נָקָה** as removal by death (c.f. Gen. v, 24) should at least have been discussed. In "The God of Love in the Old Testament." J. Philip Hyatt undertakes to show in a rather desultory and sketchy fashion that the rôle of the "love of God" in the Old Testament is much underrated. The passages adduced are the usual stock-examples of Old Testament apologetics and one misses the rigorous treatment of

their precise meaning which would have justified the renewed discussion. Thus the concept of love is much less "central" in Deuteronomy once it is realised that **אהבה** is almost synonymous with **יראה**. Julian Morgenstern believes that Is. xlii, 10-13, are a fragment of a universalist psalm of particular "literary beauty and religious fervour" which was interpolated in Isaiah. The reasons for this interpolation remain obscure, as is usual with most cases of alleged interpolation. It is true that when Is. xlii, 10-13 (and also v. 14), are excised, the remainder of the chapter gains in unity and strength. T. W. Nakarai presents "Some Notes on the Grammar of Biblical Hebrew" in which he rehearses the standard complaints and objections to the various inaccuracies, ambiguities, and obsolete and misleading terminologies disfiguring the current text-books of Hebrew grammar. O. R. Sellers discusses some "Problems in the Story of Cain" and repeats Paul Haupt's rendering of Gen. vi, 1: "I, as well as YHVH, have produced a man." For the meaning of **חָרָה** as "aggrieved" = "fallen countenance" (Gen. vi, 5), Gen. xxxiv, 7, should have been compared. Altogether the author seems to overlook the fact that words have not only an etymology but also a history, and one reader at least fails to see the point of stressing at every occurrence of **חָרָה** that it means literally "to become hot." Z.W.

ALBERT M. HYAMSON. *Jews' College, London, 1855-1955.* 142 pp., 6 plates. Published by the College, 10s. 6d.

This history, which has unfortunately had to appear posthumously, gives a full account of the origins and background of Jews' College, and details of its staffing, financing, and administration. Particulars of the syllabuses covered in the various schemes of

study prosecuted are less full. A list of the officers, including the (non-academic) Council, since the first days of the College, is given, but not a full roll of graduates; nor is there any reference to the major publications of those who have been connected with it. Since such a list would include much distinguished scholarship—mere reference to the names of Friedlaender and Buechler, both Principals of the College, is enough to indicate this—it is to be regretted that those responsible for seeing the work through the press did not think to add it. It is unfortunate that the late Mr. Hyamson did not live to supervise its production himself, for the proof-reading has fallen below his own exacting standards. In particular, a brief tribute to the author on p. 8, added after his death, contains a malapropism which he would have removed, even though it would have afforded him some sardonic amusement.

The scholarly achievements of Jews' College during its first century, quite apart from its importance as a centre for rabbinical training are ones in which it may justifiably take pride. The present *history*, however, while its figures and lists will be of great value to the social historian, scarcely does them full justice.

RAPHAEL LOEWEN.

A. PARROT. *Le Temple de Jérusalem*. (Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique, No. 5.) Delacauaux & Niestlé, Neuchâtel and Paris. 94 pp. 1954. 4.50 Swiss Francs.

The well-known excavator of Mari and curator of the Louvre has produced a serviceable little book, illustrated by many drawings plans and photographs, dealing with the Temple at Jerusalem from its foundation under Solomon to the destruction of the second edifice under Titus. The problem is discussed in the framework of

relevant cognate material in the ancient Near East, and a maximum of information is packed into a minimum of space. A few final pages deal with the fortunes of the Temple area under the later Empire, Byzantium, and the Arabs. As has been remarked by an earlier reviewer, the English literature is not fully made use of (Hollis's *Archæology of Herod's Temple*), and essays in the P.E.Q. have been passed over. The book can nevertheless fulfil a very useful function, especially in the teaching of students, if attention is drawn to these omissions.

B. S. J. ISSERLIN.

A. SCHWARZENBACH. *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des Alten Testaments*. Brill, Leiden, 1954. Pp. xii and 212. 21 fl.

This little book took its origin in a doctor thesis in the school of Professor Koehler at Zürich. The author has taken great pains in covering the Old Testament material dealing with terms for mountains, valleys, cultivated land, desert, etc. He has also considered corresponding terms in the LXX, the targums, and the Peshitta. This work has lead him to propose new meanings in a number of cases, and to suggest some emendations. His study forms a useful contribution to a little considered field, and might, one feels, perhaps lead to further research in collaboration with a trained geographer.

B. S. J. ISSERLIN.

V. D. LIPMAN. *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*. 200 pp., 2 maps. Watts, 18s.

Dr. Lipman has made an outstanding contribution to Anglo-Jewish historical writing. Written in accordance with the best standards of modern scholarship, this book can be recommended, with certain important reservations,

as an authority of the highest value on its subject. Frequent references are given to a great variety of Jewish and non-Jewish sources, there is a select bibliography, a glossary of Hebrew and Yiddish terms, an appendix of statistics and an adequate index. It is little wonder that Dr. Lipman's work was awarded a prize by the Jewish Historical Society of England.

The main topics which are covered by the *Social History* include the numbers of Jews in England, both in London and the Provincial centres, throughout the whole period, Jewish communal organisation and its development, with special reference to synagogal, charitable, and educational institutions, Jewish occupations and professions, and the extent and effects of Jewish immigration. Dr. Lipman excludes from his compass any discussion of Jewish participation in the political life of the country and the question of Jewish political emancipation. He also eschews any biographical descriptions of the comparatively few individuals whose names occur in the course of his narrative. The jejunity of his style need not deter serious students of Anglo-Jewish history from obtaining much information from this work of selective erudition.

The most serious criticism to be levied against Dr. Lipman's study is the excessive narrowness of his interpretation of the word "social." No doubt he has some etymological justification for his self-imposed limitations, but the reader must inevitably feel that Dr. Lipman has refused to ask himself questions of the utmost relevance to his subject. Unfortunately it must be said that one will gain a much more vivid and lasting impression of Jewish social life from reading 50 pages of *The*

Children of the Ghetto. Dr. Lipman says "To attempt to compete with such a description would be useless and presumptuous" (p. 133). Competition is not required or necessary, but rather an attempt to give these descriptions both background and depth.

For example, at the turn of the century, much attention seems to have been paid in both Jewish and non-Jewish circles to the addiction of many Jews to various forms of gambling and betting. The popularity of card games among Jews, the large number of Jewish bookmakers on and off the course, and in recent years the Jewish participation in the football pool business, seem to offer an important topic for research. We look in vain in the index for such references to Jewish social habits as banquets and dinners, frequency of; drunkenness, rarity of; and gambling, addiction to. The origins and development of the Jewish theatre, the activities of missionaries and their societies and a host of similar topics would not only have been relevant to Dr. Lipman's subject, but would have made his book more lively and satisfying. A patient and devoted research worker, as Dr. Lipman has so clearly proved himself to be, would not have found this task insuperable or unrewarding.

The years 1914-50 are dealt with sketchily in an epilogue of 20 pages. In common with other writers he foresees a decline in the Jewish population of this country. For the period 1850-1914 this work is strongly recommended as an invaluable guide to the communal and economic life of Anglo-Jewry and an indispensable adjunct to all future research into these topics. But as a social history it is incomplete.

AVROM SALTMAN.

INSTITUTE OF JEWISH STUDIES, MANCHESTER

"Stenecourt," Singleton Road, Salford, 7, Lancs.

A "Week of Study" for rabbis, ministers, and lay scholars was held at the Institute from December 18th to 22nd, 1955. The proceedings of the week were as follows:

Talk by Rabbi Dr. A. ALTMANN, M.A., on "The Scope and Meaning of Jewish Studies Today."

Seminar by Mr. J. G. WEISS, M.A., on "The Self-Revelation of the Torah. A Chapter from the Zohar."

Seminar by Dr. R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY on "The Quest for the Meaning of the Mitsvot. Interpretation of Selected Texts."

Talk by Dr. R. J. Z. WERBLOWSKY on "Types of Prayer."

Seminar by Rabbi Dr. A. ALTMANN, M.A., on "Divine Providence in Medieval Jewish Thought."

Paper on "Meditation, Concentration, and Prayer in 'The Testament of R. Israel Besht,'" by Rabbi B. M. CASPER, M.A.

Seminar by Professor I. TISHBY (Jerusalem) on "The Love and Fear of God. Readings from Selected Sources."

Talk by Dr. N. WIEDER (London) on "Halakhah and Minhag in Erets Israel and the Diaspora."

Seminar by Dr. N. WIEDER on "The Historical Approach to the Jewish Liturgy."

Paper on "The Theology of R. Isaac Arama," by the Rev. C. PEARL, M.A.

Public lantern lecture by Professor J. WEINGREEN (Dublin) on "The Archaeology of Palestine."

Seminar by Mr. A. RUBINSTEIN, LL.M., on "The Linguistic and Theological Significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls."

SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STUDY LECTURES

Among recent public lectures given under the auspices of the Society for Jewish Study have been the following:

Dr. B. Mazar, President and Rector of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem: "Beth Shearim: The Seat of Judah the Prince."

Dr. A. V. Levontin, of the Faculty of Law, Hebrew University, Jerusalem: "A Jewish Foreign Policy."

Dr. F. H. Heinemann, of Oxford: "In Defence of the Inner Life."

A course of lectures on "An Introduction to Jewish Law," for members of the University of London Jewish Union Society, was sponsored by the Society for Jewish Study in conjunction with the Hillel Foundation. The following lectures were given during the autumn term, 1955: "The Sources and Authorities—Torah, Mishnah, Gemarah," and "The Law of Property," by Rabbi Dr. Louis Jacobs; "The Law of Torts" and "The Law of Contracts," by Dr. Aron Owen; "History and Authority of Responsa" (from the standpoint of Comparative Law), by Bertram B. Benas; "The Law of Marriage and Divorce," by Dr. George J. Webber.

Hillel House, London, W.C.1.

HUGH HARRIS, *Hon. Secretary.*